

1988

Further validation of the PTL scale of values as expressing intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian religious orientations

Barbara J. Cannarelli Peck
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peck, Barbara J. Cannarelli, "Further validation of the PTL scale of values as expressing intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian religious orientations " (1988). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 8883.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/8883>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 8909185

**Further validation of the PTL scale of values as expressing
intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian religious
orientations**

Peck, Barbara J. Cannarelli, Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1988

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Further validation of the PTL scale of values
as expressing intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict
and humanitarian religious orientations

by

Barbara J. Cannarelli Peck

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Psychology

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Historical Background of Psychology and Religion	4
Opposing views of religiosity	4
Bias and neglect in personality measures	5
Inadequate measures of religion as a variable	8
Explanations of continued neglect	9
General contributing factors	9
Attitudinal and conceptual biases of professionals	10
More Recent Views of Psychology and Religion	15
Signs of change	15
Religious Orientation	16
Past Literature on I-E Religious Orientation	20
Current Literature on I-E	24
I-E and personality	25
Specificity of therapeutic techniques and religion as a variable	40
A developmental model of religious orientation	43
An additional dimension of religious orientation	50
Social desirability and I-E	60
Recent developments in testing I-E	64

The PTL Scale of Values	68
Intrinsic religiosity	71
Value conflict	73
Egocentrism with hostility	76
Extrinsic religiosity	81
Summary of the Literature on I-E	87
Hypotheses	92
METHOD	96
Subjects	96
Instruments	96
Procedure	103
RESULTS	107
DISCUSSION	175
REFERENCES	194
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	206
APPENDIX A. THE PTL SCALE OF VALUES	208
APPENDIX B. DESCRIPTIONS PROVIDED TO CLERGY	216

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, the impact of religion has been documented as a motivator of behavior. For example, the lives of Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi manifest the dynamics of religious beliefs, serving as an inspiration and conviction to ameliorate problematic conditions in the world. On the other hand, religion as a destructive force has been witnessed, as for example, in the mass murder and suicide of hundreds of individuals in the People's Temple in Jonestown, Guyana.

While contrasting views of the value of religious beliefs and behavior have, and probably always will, exist in psychology, the impact of such beliefs and behaviors on personality, attitudes and daily behavior presents itself as a viable research area. However, traditionally, research in psychology on the influence of religion has been limited in breadth and content as compared to other influencers of behavior. There have been several reasons set forth for this state of affairs. These will be briefly reviewed in this paper, and can be attributed in general to problems in theoretical, conceptual, attitudinal and psychometric realms in approaching the topic-area.

While such problems continue to exist, more recent times have witnessed a change in the state of affairs with more attention to religion in empirical research and as a

topic of interest in professional psychological circles. The value of considering religiosity in understanding attitudes and personality has begun to receive recognition as a heuristic and practically potent subject variable. This calls for the availability of a reliable and valid measure of religiosity for use in empirical research.

Many individuals interested in the psychology of religion have provided the field with measures of religious content which reflect the doctrinal or orthodox religious beliefs an individual might hold. While these instruments have been implemented as measure of religiosity in investigations that utilize religion as a subject variable, others have relied merely on self-reports of religious affiliation or denomination to categorize subjects as to degree of religiosity. An alternative, and more useful approach to implementing religion as a subject variable has been to focus on the functional use of religion in the life of a person. This latter approach appears to be more fruitful in evaluating the influence of religion on behavior, as will be attested to in the review of the literature presented here.

Consideration of the goals or style of an individual's religiosity focuses on a consideration of the ways of being religious, or what has been referred to as one's religious orientation. This perspective on religion reveals the

multidimensionality of religion as a variable, as opposed to the unidimensionality represented by those measures of religiosity which focus on the content of religious beliefs. Traditionally, research utilizing religiosity as a variable has implicitly assumed a unidimensional perspective. Such an approach is responsible in part for the negativism toward religion, as research utilizing this approach has supported a generally negative view of the religious individual.

In this paper a brief historical background of the traditional perspective on religion in psychology will first be presented, followed by a discussion of the more current status of views on the involvement of psychology and religion. Religious orientation as a popular and potent concept in empirical research utilizing religiosity as a variable will be presented in a review of the literature utilizing concepts from this domain. A recently developed measure of religious orientation, the Peck-Terry-Layton (PTL) Scale of Values will also be reviewed. This instrument appears to hold promise as a general tool for empirical research utilizing religiosity as a subject variable.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Background of Psychology and Religion

Opposing views of religiosity

Historically, major psychological views concerning religious behavior have presented contrasting and contrary positions. Religion is seen by some major theorists, such as Allport (1956), Jung (1938) and Frankl (1967), in a positive light as a facilitator of psychological well-being. In their view, religion is seen as an enhancer of emotional stability, serving as a vehicle for integration of the various facets of life, and as a provider for meaning in life. Other major theorists have placed religion in a negative light, such as Freud (1953), Reik (1951) and Jones (1923). These theorists associate religious behavior with psychoneurosis, viewing it under an obsessive-compulsive paradigm, related to delusions, wish-fulfillment and regressive, infantile behavior. These opposing views of religion and religiosity have prevailed in the field of psychology to the present day. They have been recently aired by Bergin (1980), who views religion in a positive light, and Ellis (1980), who views it in a negative light.

The state of the literature concerning religiosity has likewise reflected divergent views with regard to the relationship between religion and mental health. Research prior to 1962 had generated a generally negative picture of

the religious person, portraying such characteristics as emotional distress, rigidity, pessimism, prejudice, inferior intelligence, suspiciousness and conformity (Martin & Nichols, 1962). Bergin (1983) relates this pathologically tinged portrait of the religious person to the intellectual climate prevailing in the behavioral sciences at the time, when behaviorism, materialism and operationalism predominated.

Since the early 1960s, the status of religion has gradually become more positive, and a less negative light has been shed on religiosity as a variable in the realm of empirical research. However, what appears to be a perennial clash of opposing views continues to exist (cf. Bergin, 1983). Such conflicting views are inevitable, partly due to the attitudinal and conceptual biases of professionals (as Bergin, 1983; Malony, 1977 and Marx & Spray, 1969 imply), and because of the personality and religiosity measures utilized in research on this variable. These will be discussed in turn.

Bias and neglect in personality measures

With regard to personality measures, inherent scoring biases exist against pro-religious responses on instruments that tap measures of authoritarianism, dogmatism, ego strength, ethnocentrism and irrational thinking (Bergin, 1983), causing spurious negative relationships between

religiosity and mental health. For example, on Barron's Ego Strength Scale (1953) there are a total of seven religious content items of which five, if answered in a proreligious direction, are scored negatively. This would lead to lower ego strength scores for proreligious individuals.

Speaking further to the neglect of religiosity as a variable in personality measures are two studies utilizing the MMPI. Groesch and Davis (1977) suggest that the influence of religiosity, as a subject variable, should have been investigated some time ago. They base this conclusion on the results of their investigation of the relationship between psychiatric patients' MMPI scale scores and their religion. They found that religious affiliation (i.e., Protestant or Catholic), along with diagnosis, age and education, significantly influenced scale scores on L, Hy, D, Mf, Pa and Sc. The authors did not report directionality or specific denominational differences, feeling this would be premature, since this study used a small sample of patients from a restricted area of the population (VA patients in Indiana). A methodological shortcoming was the use of religious affiliation instead of some more accurate and multidimensional measure of religion as the independent variable. Nevertheless, the results are suggestive of the importance of religiosity as a subject variable that could

influence test scores, psychiatric diagnosis and subsequent treatment.

Bohrnstedt, Borgatta and Evans (1968), using a large sample of college students in a midwestern university, investigated the impact of religion on MMPI scores. They used religious affiliation and an instrument to tap religiosity which consisted of six items that appear to represent a proreligious attitude. These authors found that among the various religious affiliations (Catholic, Protestant, Jew or No Religious Identification) there were significant differences on Mf, F, D, Hy, Pd and Sc scales, with No Religious Identification subjects scoring higher in general. Their measure of religiosity was also significantly negatively correlated with D, Hy, Pd, Mf, Sc, ? and F scales. All MMPI mean scores fell within normal range, hence these differences cannot be interpreted as evidence for more positive mental health associated with religious individuals. The important point to be made here is that these authors concluded that the MMPI may not be a representative measure of personality when studying religiosity and religious identification as it contains religious content items on several of its scales. Scales D, Mf and F, which contain the highest number of religious content items, were found to exhibit the highest

correlations with the religiosity measure in this investigation.

Inadequate measures of religion as a variable

The inherent bias against religion as a variable is further exaggerated by inadequate measures of religiosity itself, which fail to consider the multidimensionality of religion: the wide variation among individuals in their religious sentiments, content and behavior. This inadequacy can be seen in the two investigations cited above. Both used religious affiliation as one measure of religiosity. This is inadequate because it is a discrete, nominal categorization of subjects, which ignores important qualifying information, such as extent of religious affiliation (is it nominal only?) and depth of religious beliefs and practices (are they motivating the subject's dispositions and behaviors, and to what extent?).

Most studies of personality using the variable of religiosity have dealt with it as a single, unitary factor (McClain, 1978), resulting in the presentation of an inaccurate, overgeneralized and negative picture of the religious person. When the multidimensionality of religion is taken into consideration, hence, discriminating between individuals who can be considered as truly religious (i.e., living their faith), and those who can be considered as identifying themselves as religious in name only (i.e.,

merely using religion), the generally negative characteristics of the truly religious individual disappear, and the relationship between religion and mental health becomes positive. These studies will be discussed in a later section of this paper.

Despite the above insights into attitudinal, conceptual, psychometric and research biases toward religion that are known to exist, the fact remains that religiosity as a variable is neglected in psychology as a whole and in professional training in particular (Bergin, 1983).

Explanations of continued neglect

General contributing factors Hunsberger (1980)

discusses the factors that are contributing to the ignorance and neglect which surround religion as a variable in psychology. Among these factors are those which can be categorized as internal (within the study of religion itself) and external (outside the study of religion) contributors. Contributors that can be referred to as internal factors include: the breadth of content in the psychology of religion, the lack of focus, and weakness in the area empirically and theoretically. Among the factors which can be referred to as external include: lack of acknowledgement of religiosity as a variable in most psychology textbooks; most religious research is published

in specialized religiously oriented journals, leading to a lack of awareness of relevant literature concerning the psychology of religion; religious journals are little known sources of information to many professionals; and such journals are often unavailable in many libraries. The situation does not contribute to enhancing appreciation of religion as a variable among professionals.

Attitudinal and conceptual biases of professionals

Bergin (1983) emphasizes that empirical literature and education in the mental health field are, furthermore, neglectful of and biased against religion. This is due to the fact that among mental health professionals there exists little appreciation for our religious subcultures. He asserts that further perpetuating this is the lack of content in clinical training programs that could increase such awareness and appreciation of religiosity as a variable in psychological functioning. Moreover, Bergin cogently points out that there exists a noticeable discrepancy in the attention given to religion versus the consciousness-raising that exists with regard to race, gender and ethnic origin.

The need for a consciousness-raising concerning religious values is an especially cogent issue in the field of psychotherapy. While professional psychological circles continue to be pervaded by contrary views concerning the

realm of religion, there exists a substantial pro-religious interest in the general population.

A recent Gallup survey, Religion in America (1981), indicates that 93% of the general population sampled state a religious preference, 69% are members of a church or synagogue, 55% rank religion in their lives as being very important, and 31% feel that religion ranks as the most important thing in their lives. In contrast to the importance of religion in the lives of the general population, professionals in psychology are generally less involved in religion (Marx & Spray, 1969), tend to undervalue its significance in people's lives, and, furthermore, when they do view it as a significant force, they often perceive it as a negative force in people's lives (Bergin, 1983).

Hence, what may be further biasing the psychological view of religion is the psychologist's general negative view of the subject-matter. With regard to psychotherapists in specific, a negative bias toward religion has been further documented.

Nix (1978), in an investigation of religious values of psychotherapists, has found religion to be a subject against which the field of psychotherapy is biased. The findings of the study revealed that therapists had a great deal of emotion, conflict and defensiveness concerning the issue of

religion, which stemmed from their personal concerns regarding issues of dependency, control and authority. These concerns are often reflected in the therapist image of superiority and omnipotence.

Henry, Sims and Spray (1971) found that the religious values of psychotherapists were largely discrepant from those of the general population in the direction of being religiously liberal. Their study covered several thousand psychotherapists in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. Two other studies that speak to this point are Vaughan (1971) and Lilienfeld (1966), which also demonstrated the large discrepancies found between the values held by mental health professionals and those of the average client.

The field of psychotherapy represents a cogent example of an area where the neglect of religion and religious values can present serious implications. The notion of the value-free counselor in the counseling situation is a myth. The counselor does communicate a value model to the client, implicitly or explicitly. Research in psychotherapy suggests that the values in general, and the religious values in specific, that therapists hold enter into the therapeutic process, the conceptualization of clients, and conceptions of mental health and illness (Bergin, 1980; Beutler, 1979; Strupp, 1978; Kessel & McBrearty, 1967). A pretense of neutrality on religious issues is illogical; the

values upon which the therapist bases his or her conceptions of mental health are based in part on his or her personal values--- and treatment of the client may well be influenced by these same values (Halleck, 1976).

As with issues of sexuality, family life and personal ambitions, when religious values enter into the therapeutic endeavor, psychotherapy is in essence opening another Pandora's box; though this may be desirable to avoid, such a stance is impractical--- it is not unrealistic to think that a confrontation with religious values is often encountered in the psychotherapeutic profession, and, hence, must be inevitably dealt with (London, 1976). It is worthy to note that while research in psychotherapy effectiveness has been orienting itself toward analyses of greater specificity of the therapist-client relationship, the impact of religious values on the therapeutic dyad has largely gone unresearched (Bergin, 1980).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to deal with all the relevant questions posed by religion as a factor in the therapeutic endeavor or elsewhere in the domain of psychology. Up to this point in time, all such relevant questions emanate from a common source: a general lack of knowledge and interest in psychology regarding the influence of the religious variable on psychological functioning. What can be said, however, is that in order to

systematically explore the impact of religiosity as a variable, a reliable and valid instrument is needed to measure religiosity in a multidimensional manner.

In summary, we have touched upon some of the attitudinal, conceptual and psychometric biases in psychology which are inherently opposing research on religiosity as a variable. A pertinent remark that may very well sum up the years of neglect and negativism was made by Robert Hogan, section editor of the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology in 1979, "Religion is the most important social force in the history of man.... But in psychology, anyone who gets involved or tries to talk in an analytic careful way about religion is immediately branded a meat-head; a mystic; an intuitive, touchy-feely sort of moron" (Hogan, 1979, p. 4).

Currently, the situation may be changing with respect to interest in religiosity as a variable. The psychology of religion appears to be receiving more attention, and the study of religion as a variable has been improved by consideration of its multidimensionality. In turning to the more recent views of religion as a variable, this paper will focus on intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of religious orientation which have currently been popular in religious research in the domain of psychology (Bergin, 1983).

More Recent Views of Psychology and Religion

Signs of change

While controversy over the value of religion continues to exist, religion as a variable has received an increase in attention in psychology in the present decade. It may be that events such as the Jonestown tragedy, the potential impact of the Moral majority upon national elections, and increased attention to the operation of multimillion dollar religious organizations have contributed to the increase in curiosity, if not genuine empirical interest, in the religious realm.

An increase in professional interest in religion has been evidenced in the fields of counseling and psychology. Rapid growth has taken place in recent years in Division 36 of the American Psychological Association for Religious and Value Issues in Counseling of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (American Association for Religious and Value Issues in Counseling, 1981). Organizations such as the Association for Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists and the Christian Association for Psychological Studies further attest to interest in religious issues within the profession.

In a recent issue of the American Psychologist, Kilbourne and Richardson (1984) pointed to the competition

that the "new religions" have provided for the therapeutic marketplace. Christian counseling as a specific and unique approach to counseling and therapy has also emerged (Strong, 1976, 1977, 1980). Bergin (1980) has issued a plea for inclusion of a theistic perspective in psychotherapy, as well as a plea for increased attention to religiosity as a variable in psychological theorizing, research and techniques in general.

In the empirical realm, much of the recent work that has been done utilizing religion as a variable within a multidimensional perspective is based on Allport's original concepts of intrinsic (I) and extrinsic (E) religious orientation.

Religious Orientation

The origin of the concept of religious orientation is rooted in Allport's research on the nature of prejudice in religious individuals. A substantial amount of research provided evidence for those scoring high in church attendance to be more highly correlated with measures of prejudice than those scoring as nonchurch attenders (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson & Sanford, 1950; Gough, 1951; Kirkpatrick, 1949; Rokeach, 1960; Stember, 1961; Stouffer, 1955). Allport and Ross (1967) investigated the nature of what appeared to them to be a paradox in finding that religious persons are more

prejudiced than nonreligious individuals. Based on the findings of a curvilinear relationship between church attendance and prejudice, and establishing that it is the infrequent attender who is more prejudiced than the frequent attender, Allport went on to identify different forms of religious orientation.

The motivation of the extrinsically religious person was hypothesized to differ from the motivation of the intrinsically religious person. Allport defined the person with an extrinsic religious orientation as,

...using his religious views to provide security, comfort, status, or social support for himself--- religion is not a value in its own right, it serves other needs, and it is a purely utilitarian formation (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 439).

His description of the person with an intrinsic religious orientation is one who,

...regards faith as a supreme value in its own right. Such faith strives to transcend self-centered needs, takes seriously the commandment of brotherhood that is found in all religions and seeks a unification of being (Allport, 1966, p. 205).

Allport's hypotheses concerning different religious orientations as affecting relationships between religiosity and other variables turned out to be quite informative,

encouraging much research in a reevaluation of the religious variable, and in shedding new light on religion as a personality factor. Allport went on to develop the Religious Orientation Inventory (also referred to as the Religious Orientation Scale {ROS}) as a measure of religious involvement on the intrinsic-extrinsic continuum. The scale contains a series of 20 statements, each worded in an intrinsic or extrinsic direction, thereby making up two subscales. Eleven items comprise the extrinsic subscale and nine make up the intrinsic subscale. After each statement, respondents are given four choices ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement. An example from the intrinsic subscale is:

My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.

An item from the extrinsic subscale reads:

What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.

Respondents are then assigned to one of four religious orientation categories according to their scores---intrinsic, extrinsic, indiscriminately proreligious and nonreligious. The categories are not considered to be discrete; they reflect tendencies toward the four religious orientations. Agreement with intrinsic items and disagreement with extrinsic items reflects a consistently

intrinsic religious orientation; agreement with extrinsic items and disagreement with intrinsic items reflects a consistently extrinsic religious orientation; agreement with both extrinsic and intrinsic items reflects an indiscriminately proreligious orientation (which Allport likened to yeasayers); and disagreement with both types of items is indicative of a nonreligious orientation.

Allport urged that the distinction between the different categories of religious orientation be taken into consideration when employing the variable of religion in research. He contends that there are wide variations among individuals in their religious sentiments, content and behavior, and has, therefore, rejected the use of a single religious variable as too vague in the study of differences among people. Studies that use religiosity as a component of personality in relation to personal well-being without regard to the nature of the individual's involvement with religion are ignoring a critical point.

Gorsuch (1984) distinguishes between functional versus nonfunctional approaches to the use of questionnaires designed to measure religiosity. In functional approaches, the use of religion is focused on; whereas in nonfunctional approaches, the content of religion (e.g., beliefs, values, experiences) is being measured. Gorsuch advocates the functional approach in terms of revealing the impact of

religiosity on psychological functioning. Allport's concepts of intrinsic/extrinsic religious orientations are a prime example of the functional approach.

Religious orientation appears to be a potent concept as a measure of religiosity. An instrument that can accurately assess the ways of being religious could prove to uncover some important relationships underlying the nomological net of personality and human functioning. The importance of the concepts of intrinsic (I) and extrinsic (E) religiosity has been borne out empirically. In this section of this paper a brief summary of the literature up to the present decade on these concepts will be presented, followed by more current literature related to Allport's concepts of religious orientation.

Past Literature on I-E Religious Orientation

The literature up to approximately 1980 on I and E can be divided into four categories: I-E and mental health, I-E and locus of control, I-E and fear of death/purpose in life, and I-E as a personality variable. Summaries of the relationship between I and E and the aforementioned variables will be presented here. For a more detailed review see Peck (1983).

The literature overall supports the notion that intrinsics have healthier mental characteristics than extrinsics. An extrinsic religious orientation has

repeatedly been shown to be associated with such characteristics as prejudice, rigidity, suspicion and personal immaturity (e.g., Allport & Ross, 1967; Brannon, 1970; Feagin, 1964; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974; Photiadis & Biggar, 1962), while an intrinsic orientation is associated with the opposite healthier characteristics (McClain, 1978). More specifically, intrinsics, as compared to extrinsics, have been associated with better social adjustment and ego strength (Rice, 1971); emotional stability, empathy and trust (Entner, 1977); rational thinking (Baither & Saltzberg, 1978); and less existential anxiety (Sturgeon & Hamby, 1979). One investigation found no difference between intrinsics and extrinsics on a short form of the MMPI (Bradford, 1978).

There is strong empirical evidence that an intrinsic religious orientation is associated with internal locus of control and an extrinsic orientation is associated with external locus of control. Among the studies supporting this relationship are Strickland and Schaffer (1971), Kivett, Watson and Busch (1977), Sturgeon and Hamby (1979), Tong (1978), and Kahoe (1974).

Though mixed findings have been reported, overall, the literature also supports a negative relationship between an intrinsic religious orientation and death anxiety or fear of death (Hinton, 1972; Kahoe & Dunn, 1975; Minton & Spilka,

1976; Spilka, Stout, Minton & Sizemore, 1977; Clark, 1979). Fieffel and Nagy (1981) found support for low scores on intrinsic religious orientation to covary with a high degree of fear of death. Two investigations found no difference between scores on measures of intrinsic or extrinsic religious orientations and fear of death (McCarthy, 1975; Sullivan, 1977). One study reported a negative correlation between an extrinsic religious orientation and several fear of death measures, and found an intrinsic religious orientation to be positively correlated with one fear of death measure (Magni, 1973).

Mixed findings have resulted in investigations utilizing the variables of religious orientation and purpose-in-life. Those with an intrinsic orientation have been found to exhibit higher purpose-in-life scores than those with an extrinsic orientation (Soderstrom & Wright, 1977) and to be correlated with higher purpose-in-life scores, while those scoring as extrinsic were uncorrelated with them (Crandall & Rasmussen, 1975). One investigation reported finding those with an intrinsic and those with an indiscriminately proreligious orientation to have a significantly higher degree of purpose-in-life than those with an extrinsic religious orientation; however, no significant differences were found between those scoring as intrinsic and indiscriminately proreligious (Bolt, 1975).

One investigation found no difference between those with an intrinsic and those with an extrinsic religious orientation with regard to purpose-in-life scores (McCarthy, 1975).

Intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of religious orientation have also been postulated to be pervasive personality variables that could prove useful in understanding and predicting behavior (Dittes, 1969; Hunt & King, 1969). Relationships between these dimensions and characteristics of mental health, prejudice, locus of control and fear of death have been found as discussed above. Various investigations report further differences in favor of those with an intrinsic religious orientation on such variables as intrinsic motivation, grade point average and responsibility (Kahoe, 1974); basic personality differences (McClain, 1978; Hamby, 1973); value systems (Tate & Miller, 1971; Crandall & Rasmussen, 1975); work values (Morris & Hood, 1981); susceptibility to attitude change (Haynes, 1971); attitude toward a rape victim (Joe, McGee & Glazey, 1977); and nonspontaneous helping behavior (Benson, DeHority, Jarman, Hanson, Hochschwender, Lebold & Sullivan, 1980). The relationship between spontaneous helping behavior and religious orientation was explored in one investigation, and produced nonsignificant differences between religious orientation and helping (Darley & Batson, 1973).

With regard to sex differences in religious orientation, no relationship was found between sex-role identification and religious orientation in one study (Smith, 1978); females were found to be more intrinsic than males in some investigations (Kivett, 1979; Strickland & Schaffer, 1971; Baither & Saltzberg, 1978); and two studies reported no significant differences between religious orientation and gender (Bradford, 1978; McClain, 1978).

The intrinsic/extrinsic dimensions of religious orientation have been investigated in the recent literature, and an update on these studies will now be presented.

Current Literature on I-E

Most of the recent literature on the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of religious orientation would fall under the rubric of I-E and personality. Two can be categorized as investigations regarding the specificity of therapeutic techniques and religious orientation. One study postulates a developmental model of religious orientation, and it is worthy to note that a new (although somewhat disappointing) dimension of religious orientation, referred to as religion as quest, has also been proposed. Social desirability has been implicated as a variable interacting with I-E, and finally, developments have been made in the test domain. A current presentation of a modified version of Allport's Religious Orientation Scale (ROS), has been

proposed, as well as the PTL Scale of Values, which appears to be a promising instrument for research on religious orientation. Each of these new developments will now be discussed.

I-E and personality

Hunsberger and Platonow (1986) investigated the relationship between religiousness, nonspontaneous helping behavior and actual behavioral intentions (as opposed to self-reports of behavior). Volunteering for charitable causes was used as the measure of actual behavioral intentions. Religiosity was measured by both a scale of religious orthodoxy and the ROS, which indicates religious orientation.

It was found that those scoring as high in religiousness as measured by the religious orthodoxy scale indicated that they were more likely to help in religiously related situations, however, not in nonreligiously related situations (e.g., charitable groups). These individuals were found to be no more likely than those who scored as less religious (on the orthodoxy scale) to volunteer to help in nonreligiously related situations. However, those who scored as having an intrinsic religious orientation were found to volunteer to help in nonreligiously related situations (charitable groups) more so than those who scored

as having an extrinsic religious orientation. This is consistent with past research.

Overall, the study indicates that the relationship between helping behavior and religiosity is better assessed by measures of religious orientation rather than measures of religious orthodoxy. Also of importance is the finding that social desirability (as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale) apparently was not an intervening variable in the relationship between religious orientation and helping behavior.

Another investigation covering an area related to personality suggests utilizing a measure of religious orientation versus other operationalizations of religiosity. Baker and Gorsuch (1982) addressed the conflicting results in the literature on the relationship between religion and anxiety. Measures included the ROS, the IPAT Anxiety Scale (Scheier & Cattell, 1960) as an operationalization of trait anxiety, and the STAI (Spielberger, Gorsuch & Lushene, 1970) as a measure of state anxiety.

These authors found that in a sample of N=52, obtained from a religious wilderness camping organization, intrinsicness was inversely related to extrinsicness. For all subscales of the IPAT, except two (Guilt Proneness and Frustration Tension), intrinsicness was significantly related in a negative direction, and extrinsicness was

significantly related in a positive direction. The analysis, therefore, indicated that trait anxiety appears to be associated with an extrinsic religious orientation, while an intrinsic orientation seems to operate in an inverse manner. State anxiety was not significantly related to either religious orientation.

More specifically, the scores on the various subscales of the IPAT that were significant in correlation with intrinsic scores suggest that intrinsicness is related to greater ego strength and the ability to balance emotional forces within the self; an integration of social behavior regarding socially approved standards of behavior; and less paranoia and suspicious insecurity. The significant negative correlation with the overall measure of trait anxiety suggests that intrinsics are less anxious in general. Extrinsicness appears to be associated with these characteristics in an opposite manner.

Baker and Gorsuch conclude that research which operationalizes religiosity in a more generalized manner, ignoring the variable of religious orientation, is questionable in terms of its results. Religious samples may vary in terms of their composition as to intrinsicness and extrinsicness. The authors suggest that this situation could bias the conclusions of research in that if more extrinsics were represented in a sample than intrinsics, a

positive relationship between religion and anxiety would be seen. Viceversa, if intrinsic religiosity were over-represented, a spuriously negative relationship between religion and anxiety would result. This is an important implication regarding the design of research involving the religious variable. In fact, these thoughts could explain the presence of conflicting results in the literature regarding the relationship between religion and mental health and psychosocial adjustment.

Another recent study addresses the idea that methodological difficulties may abound in the literature utilizing religion as a variable. Van Haitsma (1986) conducted an investigation of personal adjustment of the aged as related to religiosity. A group of retirement home residents was administered a measure of personal adjustment along with Hoge's (1972) Intrinsic Religious Motivation scale. A significant correlation was found between intrinsic religiosity scores and personal adjustment scores in the positive direction.

Allport (1963) predicted that mental health was related to intrinsic religiosity. The Van Haitsma study, among others, supports this notion. More specifically, Van Haitsma suggests that the inconsistencies found in the literature regarding the relationship between religiosity and personal adjustment in the aged may be due to

inappropriate operationalizations of the religious variable. Religious orientation is an important theoretical and methodological concept that should be taken into consideration in studies of personal adjustment, personality and mental health.

In a study that addressed self-righteousness as a personality construct, Falbo and Sheppard (1986) included the ROS and Batson's Interactional scale (Batson & Ventis, 1982) as measures of religiosity. The findings of the study that are relevant to this paper are those concerning religious orientation.

Falbo and Sheppard differentiate four types, or ways of being, self-righteous: the inferior, arrogant, meek and broad-minded. The results of their study indicate that the broad-minded, who are low in self-righteousness, have higher intrinsic scores than any of the other three self-righteous types. The insecure type, which is high in self-righteousness, exhibited high extrinsic scores. On the quest dimension, high scores were found for the meek and broad-minded types.

The implications of the study for religious orientation are that intrinsics, who score high in broad-mindedness, are apt to exhibit a selfless concern about others, tend to base decision-making on reasoning and evidence, are least likely to use anger as a power strategy, are low in self-

righteousness (though they have convictions), are less likely to display social dysfunction, express relatively low concern about submission to others and are high in self-esteem. The extrinsic orientation appears to have low self-esteem, high self-righteousness, prefer to use strong power strategies, believe in the superiority of their convictions and were described by the authors as having a neurotic personality. The concepts of Horney were applied to the extrinsic in this respect. Extrinsic were postulated to deny being wrong, to be motivated to humiliate, and to avoid submission to others who are perceived as wrong. These conclusions also have relationships to concepts of mental health.

Laaser (1981) investigated the association between religion and heart disease. He hypothesized that a positive correlation would be found between measures of the Type A behavior pattern and an extrinsic religious orientation, and between the Type B behavior pattern and an intrinsic religious orientation. The ROS (Allport & Ross, 1967) and Hoge's Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale were combined to measure religious orientation. The Jenkins Activity Survey provided a measure of Type A and B behaviors.

Laaser theorized that there existed parallels between the two behavior types and religious orientation. He conceptualized Type As to prefer a religious style that was

functionally utilitarian. This was based on the Type A style of fighting against others and against time to gain control over life and the immediate environment, a concern with speedy utilitarian methods of attaining control, and concern with material security and status. The authoritarian orientation of the extrinsic type and the competitiveness and hostility of the Type A also appeared to be congruent. Type Bs, who are typically more relaxed, less hostile, competitive and urgent, were conceptualized as being congruent with an intrinsic religious orientation. Furthermore, research supports the intrinsic's greater internal sense of responsibility to others as well as a less authoritarian style.

Laaser's hypothesis was not confirmed. Correlations between A, B, I and E were nonsignificant. However, in a post hoc interpretation of the data, which included interpretations based upon interviews held with subjects (all male), Laaser reasoned that the hypothesis may not have been confirmed because the measure of religious orientation used taps only cognitive styles and is not indicative of emotional dynamics.

Laaser purports that for some subjects a conflict may have existed between what they intellectually affirmed on the religious orientation measure and what they emotionally felt. For example, Type A men were perhaps able to give

intellectual assent to the intrinsic orientation, but due to conflict at a deeper level were unable to fully participate emotionally in the intrinsic religious experience. The intrinsic religious lifestyle of these men may have been used in an attempt to control internal emotional dynamics of fear and anxiety. Hence, religious orientation served as a master motive in this respect. However, ultimately, these men were unable to give total control of their lives to God in these areas. Laaser concluded that for those Type As who score as intrinsic their Type A personality dominates even their religious faith.

For those Type Bs who score as extrinsic, Laaser states that while the same anxieties and fears exist as found in Type As, the same energy level with which to control them does not exist. Furthermore, if religion was a negative and oppressing experience for these individuals, it contributed to their anxieties and fears. Hence, they would be found to rebel against religion and relinquish any conceptions of its ability to give the desired sense of peace and meaning in life. It is for this reason that they would be extrinsic.

Overall, Laaser's investigation gives some insight into the way in which religious orientation may be conceptualized in the functioning of personality. It further implies a complex interaction between religious orientation and other personality variables.

In addressing the question of whether humanistic values are compatible with religious values, Watson, Hood and Morris (1984) used the ROS by Allport and Ross, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and two subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI): the Time Competence (TC) and Inner Support (IS) scales. These latter two measures of the POI are purported to be representative of humanistic values.

The investigation found that scores on the ROS representative of an intrinsic religious orientation were negatively correlated with high scores on the narcissism measure, while scores representative of an extrinsic religious orientation showed no significant relationship to narcissism scores. The authors concluded that this finding may indicate a propensity for the intrinsic belief system to inhibit the development of narcissistic attitudes. Scores representing an intrinsic religious orientation were found to be significantly correlated with high social desirability scores; however, the negative relationship with narcissism remained significant, even with social desirability scores partialled out. Scores representative of an extrinsic religious orientation were not significantly correlated with the measure of social desirability.

The measure of intrinsic religious orientation had no significant relationship with IS scores, and mixed findings

were presented for this orientation and TC scores--- of two independent samples, only one found high TC scores significantly correlated with intrinsic religious orientation scores. Post hoc analyses indicated that the presence of more subjects who scored as indiscriminantly pro- and anti-religious on the ROS in one of the samples suppressed the relationship between an intrinsic religious orientation and TC. The significant correlation between intrinsic religious orientation and TC scores indicates that persons who are intrinsically religiously oriented may foster a healthy time perspective similar to self-actualizers in which the past and future are meaningfully integrated into the present. This is consistent with one aspect of the humanistic value of a self-actualizing lifestyle, and indicates one area in which religious values are compatible with humanistic values.

Extrinsic religious orientation scores were significantly correlated with TC scores in a negative direction, and no significant relationship existed for scores on intrinsic religiosity and IS. This finding led the authors to conclude that the presumed incompatibility between religiosity and humanistic values may result from analyses in which those with an extrinsic religious orientation are over-represented, and the different ways of being religious are not taken into consideration.

Subjects with ROS scores representative of an intrinsic religious orientation and those with an indiscriminantly antireligious orientation were significantly over-represented on a continuum of self-actualization when considering TC scores. Those subjects with an extrinsic and an indiscriminantly proreligious orientation were significantly represented on the unactualized end of this continuum. Hence, on a humanistically-based instrument designed to tap measures of self-actualization, religious individuals are not entirely unactualized. This indicates that both religious and non-religious individuals can adhere to some humanistic values. As measured by the POI, incompatibilities with humanistic values appear to be due to those with an extrinsic religious orientation and an indiscriminantly proreligious orientation.

This investigation also indicates that religious claims against humanistic values in the sense that they may promote narcissistic self-concerns seems to be unwarranted. This is substantiated by the finding that no relationship existed between scores on the POI and narcissism.

While this investigation was limited in its scope, it contains some indications that the values of humanism and religiosity are not entirely incompatible. It also implies that the source of claims that religiosity is growth-inhibiting may be due to those with an extrinsic religious

orientation and an indiscriminantly proreligious orientation. Another important implication of this study is that an intrinsic orientation may inhibit narcissistic personality traits.

Daniel (1982) investigated the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation and the self-concept. The ROS and the Tennessee Self Concept scale served as measures. Two hundred and fifteen subjects were selected at random from a Seventh Day Adventist Church conference for young adults in the North Caribbean.

It was found that positive correlations existed between those scoring high on intrinsic religious orientation and global self-concept, as well as between high intrinsic scores and high scores on subcomponents of the global self-concept: moral-ethical, personal, family, behavior and identity components. There were no significant differences due to sex, age, education or previous religious affiliation.

Significant negative correlations were found between high scores on extrinsic religious orientation and global self-concept, as well as high scores on its moral-ethical, identity and behavior subcomponents.

Daniel concluded that intrinsic forms of personal religion share positive relationships with a favorable psychological orientation toward the self. The extrinsic

form of personal religion is indicative of some negative psychological orientations toward the self. Daniel cites Smith, Wiegart and Thomas (1979), and notes that his findings parallel theirs with regard to intrinsic expressing greater satisfaction with the self. Although it cannot, at this point in time, be determined which variable influences the other (i.e., positive self-concept or religious orientation), a relationship has been found to exist.

Gillespie (1983) explored the relationship of religious belief and religious orientation to death perspectives. He sampled a number of clergy representing three denominations: Conservative Jewish, Roman Catholic and Southern Baptist. Religious orientation was measured by the Religious Orientation scale developed by Spilka, Stout, Minton and Sizemore (1977) which combines Allport and Ross's (1967) ROS and the Committed-Consensual Scale (Spilka, Pelligrini & Dailey, 1968). Both of these instruments measure concepts of intrinsic/extrinsic religious orientation.

Gillespie's investigation found that religious orientation acted as an intervening variable between death perspectives and denominational affiliation, with religious orientation adding to the amount of variance explained by religious affiliation alone. Intrinsic religiosity scores were directly related to positive perspectives of death.

Extrinsic religiosity scores were only weakly related to negative death perspectives. No relationship was found between length of time spent in the clergy and religious orientation scores.

With regard to the variable of education, significant differences were found between noncollege graduates and college graduates with regard to religious orientation. Further analyses revealed that noncollege graduates and those with master's degrees had lower scores on extrinsic religious orientation than those with baccalaureates and doctorates. While these differences were admittedly difficult to explain, Gillespie conjectured that these differences may be a function of those individuals who served as clergy because they "got the call", hence, had no need for advanced degrees--- or if they did go on for an advanced degree (master's level), their education was sought as a natural response to "the call" in the sense that it enabled them to learn more and be better prepared to serve. Perhaps those who were motivated to continue on for the doctorate desired more status. They may not have been utilitarian in merely a religious sense, but also in an educational sense. Both religion and education may have served the self in terms of status or other needs.

Lockwood (1982) explored the relationship between psychosocial adjustment to cancer and various variables such

as sex, marital status, dysfunctional beliefs and religious orientation. Eighty-five patients were included in the study. A holisitic perspective on healing was taken, viewing it in terms of physical, social, emotional and spiritual adjustments.

Of interest to this paper are Lockwood's findings regarding religious orientation. The hypothesis that higher levels of intrinsic religiosity would be related to better psychosocial adjustment to cancer was disconfirmed. The ROS was used to determine patients' religious orientation. The intrinsic subscale did not significantly relate to any psychosocial adjustment scales. However, the extrinsic subscale was significantly related to a measure of psychological distress.

Lockwood discussed the possibility of Allport's scale lacking the specificity needed to adequately discriminate intrinsic religiosity. A review of the items on the scale led Lockwood to conclude that the intrinsic items tend to be more global in nature than the extrinsic items regarding specificity of beliefs and the meaning of religion and life in general.

Based on the findings of this study, Lockwood made specific recommendations regarding counseling the religiously oriented cancer patient. These included not focusing on the benefits of religious beliefs (e.g.,

security, cure, comfort, etc.), but on the content of such beliefs (e.g., God's love, acceptance, dependable nature, etc.). He noted that the consideration of primary importance is redirecting religious beliefs from focusing on a utilitarian perspective, i.e., not using religion as a tool to obtain one's objectives. In essence, his recommendation is to discourage the patient from an extrinsic religious orientation and approach to problems.

Two other investigations have addressed the specificity of religion as a variable in the therapeutic situation. These are discussed in the following section.

Specificity of therapeutic techniques and religion as a variable

De Blassie (1981) investigated the effects of relaxation training and Christian meditation upon anxiety, neurosis and religious orientation. Subjects were reportedly anxious individuals from local Christian churches. The experimental design involved treatment and control groups. Treatment consisted of one session of training in the relaxation response and instructions to meditate in that manner twice per day at home for eight weeks. One group received standard relaxation training, and another group received the same training, but was instructed to utilize a Christian mantra while breathing.

The ROS, Eysenck Personality Inventory and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory were given at pre- and post-treatment. Analyses revealed no significant differences between treatment groups on pre- and post-test scores of anxiety, neuroticism or intrinsic/extrinsic religious orientation.

The design of the study appeared to focus on short-term alterations in anxiety, neurosis and religious orientation as a function of relaxation training with and without the use of a Christian mantra. The study reported no checks for compliance with treatment over the eight week period; nor was any attempt made to assign subjects to treatment groups by religious orientation. Post hoc analyses revealed a significantly greater number of subjects scoring high on the intrinsic subscale of the ROS were in the standard relaxation training group that did not use the Christian mantra. It would have been instructive to assign subjects to treatment groups based on religious orientation. Intuitively, it would seem that those with an intrinsic orientation would have benefitted more from use of the Christian mantra than those with an extrinsic orientation. However, training with regard to religious specificity remains for future research to test.

Wenger (1981) investigated the impact of intrinsic religious motivation, purpose-in-life and locus of control on hospitalized alcoholics. Religious orientation was

measured by Hoge's Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale. Wenger purports that intrinsic religious motivation is conceptually similar to the spiritual surrender to a Higher Power which is a basic tenet in the Alcoholics Anonymous treatment program.

Results of his investigation pertinent to this paper include the finding that intrinsic religious motivation (IRM) significantly increased as evidenced by a comparison of pre- and post-treatment IRM scores; and at discharge, IRM scores were significantly correlated with Purpose-in-Life Test scores (PIL). At post-test there was no significant correlation of IRM with Locus of Control (LOC) scores, while pre-treatment IRM scores were positively correlated with external LOC scores. Post-treatment IRM scores and patient response to treatment (as measured by self-congruence scores and aftercare attendance) were not correlated significantly. However, post-treatment IRM scores were significantly correlated with PIL scores, which were, in turn, significantly correlated with self-congruence scores, one of the criteria of patient response to treatment.

From this relationship, Wenger concluded that intrinsic religious motivation has therapeutic value. Intrinsic religious motivation scores were seen as conceptually analogous to, and as an operational definition of, "surrender to a Higher Power", a salient portion of the

Alcoholics Anonymous treatment program philosophy. Hence, the results of this investigation were considered to be a psychometric evaluation of the therapeutic value of a religious attitude in alcoholism treatment.

A developmental model of religious orientation

Allport (1959) alluded to the development of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Both orientations may have self-centered origins in common, but the influence of environmental and temperamental (inherent personality dispositions) factors are speculated as influencing one's ultimate religious orientation. The young child is postulated to use religion in the sense of providing psychological security. If a child experiences deep needs as a function of insecurity, feelings of inferiority, suspicion and mistrust, this child is postulated to be predisposed to use religion in an extrinsic manner. If a child is raised in an atmosphere of basic trust and security, this child is postulated to be predisposed to developing an intrinsic religious orientation.

Kahoe (1985) points out that "...no known study and little speculation have further addressed the psychological (temperamental, personality, familial, socio-cultural) determinants of intrinsic and extrinsic religion" (p. 409). He laments that although these orientations have been used as independent variables, they have been ignored as

dependent variables. Kahoe further speculates that intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations may occur simultaneously in an individual because they may have different sources within one's developing personality. He cites some of his research which indicates that intrinsic and extrinsic job motivation appears to have different roots in personality structure. However, some individuals are speculated to reach a point at which these opposing religious stances are resolved, and the two religious orientations become diametrically opposed within the individual. Kahoe cogently points out the need for more research concerning the development of religious orientation.

Kahoe and Meadow (1981) propose a developmental model of religious orientation. They posit that religious development progresses through a sequence of four religious orientations: extrinsic religiousness, observance religiousness, intrinsic religiousness and autonomous religiousness. They envision these four orientations along a continuum and do not posit the existence of discrete religious stages. Kahoe and Meadow's developmental sequence is based on Brown's (1964) model of religious faith.

Brown (1964) proposed a model of religious faith based on two dimensions. One was his own conception of a bipolar dimension representing at one end an "outward" orientation

toward religious institutions and at the other end an "inward" orientation toward individual judgment. The second dimension was conceptualized as a bipolar dimension based on Allport's intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Kahoe and Meadow refer to Brown's "outward" and "inward" poles as observance religiousness and autonomous religiousness, respectively.

The psychological manifestations of religious beliefs and behavior are hypothesized to have roots in strong dynamic or motivational bases. Individuals initially seek out religion in an ego defensive manner as a result of various fears and anxieties which serve as motivators. These fears and anxieties may be physically, socially, psychologically or existentially based, and they cause the individual to seek out and utilize religion in a palliative manner. Hence, religious beliefs and practices are originally extrinsically motivated (i.e., extrinsic in nature).

Gradual movement from extrinsic to observance religious orientations takes place as individuals participate in institutionalized religion. With institutionalized religion, the individual benefits from social or affiliative activities as well as doctrine and teachings which provide relief from the fears and anxieties that motivated them to seek out religion in the first place. Concomitantly, the

person is observing the rituals of the religion and conforming to its doctrinal beliefs.

Subscription to the belief system of the religion may become internalized and the person may be motivated to live by the belief system of the faith. This constitutes entrance into the intrinsic sequence of religious development. Virtually all religions are purported to advocate surrender of self-interests and endorse devotion to religious causes and ideals. However, not all persons achieve substantial degrees of intrinsic faith. Kahoe and Meadow postulate that this may be due to inherent dispositions toward an intrinsic orientation in general.

The step beyond an intrinsic religious orientation is conceptualized as autonomous religiousness. Few individuals are purported to reach this orientation. In essence, autonomous religiousness is an individualized religion free of the traditional, conventional, rule-oriented phenomena of organized religion. A totally autonomous religious orientation is antagonistic to the interests of organized religion. An autonomous faith is likened to a striving toward self-actualization in the religious realm.

Kahoe and Meadow assert that their developmental schema of religious belief and behavior receives intuitive support from the congruency their model shares with other developmental theories. They discuss the similarities of

their developmental sequence with Allport's theorizing about the development of mature religion from original motives of organic and security needs, Maslow's motivational need hierarchy, Kohlberg's stages of moral development and Loewinger's model of ego development.

The Kahoe and Meadow developmental schema is an interesting and heuristically potent concept. They posit that relationships may exist between religious development and personality development in general. For example, development of motivational style, moral judgment, ego development, cognitive stages and socialization may parallel and intertwine with religious development. The outstanding limitation of their model may be their position on the intrinsic/extrinsic dimension. These orientations are conceptualized as bipolar, which has not totally received empirical support (cf. Hunt & King, 1969 for a review opposing a unidimensional, bipolar conception of intrinsicness and extrinsicness).

Related to this criticism is the fact that Kahoe and Meadow negate the existence of stages of religious development and prefer to conceptualize developmental progression along a continuum. If intrinsic and extrinsic orientations are separate dimensions, this would seem to imply the existence of stages of development with unique and identifiable characteristics associated with each stage. In

this respect, Kahoe and Meadow (1981) are also inconsistent in their terminology, as they refer to their schema as having "levels" (p. 15), and refer to the existence of "higher levels" (p. 15), and go on to infer that their model might be better characterized as an "upward spiral" (p. 15) versus a "flat model" (p. 15). These concepts appear to this author as more congruent with a stage model.

Ernsberger and Manaster (1981) tested the relationship between intrinsic religiosity and Kohlberg's stages of moral development. The ROS was used to measure religious orientation.

Various denominations were categorized according to their doctrinal principals as to how characteristic they were of one of Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning. A significant correlation was found between intrinsic religiosity scores and level of moral development. Significant differences were also found between intrinsically oriented members of the different denominations (who, again, represented different stages of moral reasoning) on a measure of moral reasoning which required application of moral judgments. Moral judgments were made in accordance with the denomination's characteristic doctrinal commitment to a stage of moral reasoning.

These findings indicate that intrinsically religious members of a particular denomination observe and functionally apply the moral teachings of their faith at the level of moral reasoning promoted by their respective religions. This gives credence to the notion that the intrinsically religious individual internalizes and "lives" his or her religious beliefs and is motivated by such beliefs. This investigation further indicates that religious variables have an effect on the moral development of adults, which has implications for the involvement of religious orientation in personality.

The results of this investigation also have implications which bear on Kahoe and Meadow's (1981) developmental schema of religious orientation. The Ernsberger and Manaster investigation indicates that Kahoe and Meadow may be correct in positing a relationship between religious development and personality development, at least with regard to moral judgment. However, the relationship may not be one that can be conceptualized along parallel religious and personality developmental continuums. Personality characteristics may be more specifically determined by stages of religious orientation, and furthermore, influenced by specific religious orientations.

The notion of the uniformity myth (Kiesler, 1966) may apply here. It may be more fruitful to conceptualize the

relationship of personality and religious orientation in a more specific manner; i.e., what personality variables are influenced by which religious orientation of what particular denomination. It is not the desire nor the intention of this author to delve into denominational differences. However, it clearly makes intuitive sense when focusing on a specific personality variable to consider the influence of specific intrinsically held religious beliefs, as these beliefs are purported to motivate behavior.

An additional dimension of religious orientation

Batson and his colleagues have recently been attempting to make the case for the inclusion of another form of religious orientation which they refer to as a quest orientation (e.g., Batson & Ventis, 1982; Batson & Raynor-Prince, 1983). Batson and his colleagues feel that the intrinsic orientation does not represent fully Allport's classic concept of mature religion.

Allport's concept of mature religion was set forth in 1950. His early formulation included certain identifying characteristics:

While we guard against overestimating the consistency and completeness of the mature religious sentiment, we may nonetheless list the attributes that mark it off from the immature sentiment. By comparison, the mature sentiment is 1) well differentiated; 2) dynamic in

character in spite of its derivative nature; 3) productive of a consistent morality; 4) comprehensive; 5) integral; 6) fundamentally heuristic. It will be seen that these criteria are nothing else than special applications in the religious sphere of the tests for maturity of personality: a widened range of interests, insight into oneself, and the development of an adequately embracing philosophy of life (Allport, 1950, p. 57).

Allport went on to amplify mature religion and indicated that, "...it is the outgrowth of many successive discriminations and continuous reorganization" (p. 59), and provides for a "master-motive" in life, dealing openly and honestly with "matters central to all existence", and leads one to "act wholeheartedly even without absolute certainty. It can be sure without being cocksure" (Allport, 1950, p. 72). The flavor of the mature religious individual is not one of compulsiveness, nor of being fanatical.

Batson and his colleagues assert that when Allport translated his original concept of mature religion into intrinsic religion in the late 1950s, he neglected to emphasize the notion of flexibility, openness and uncertainty in dealing with life's questions. Furthermore, Batson et al. assert that the quest dimension, which their investigations have uncovered, includes this missing aspect

of mature religion and constitutes a third "way of being religious" (Batson & Ventis, 1982, p. 149; also see Batson & Raynor-Prince, 1983). The quest dimension essentially represents "...the degree to which an individual's religion involves an open-ended, responsive dialogue with existential questions raised by the contradictions and tragedies of life" (Batson & Ventis, 1982, pp. 152 & 154).

It is asserted by this author that the quest dimension which Batson et al. have tapped into is not, in fact, a "way of being religious" and hence, is not a specific religious orientation at all. The concept may be merely an approach to thinking about religious issues. To quote Batson and Ventis:

...an individual who approaches religion in this way recognizes that he or she does not know, and probably never will know, the final truth about such matters. But still the questions are deemed important, and however tentative and subject to change, answers are sought. There may not be a belief in a transcendent reality, but there is a transcendent, religious dimension to the individual's life. We shall call this open-ended, questioning orientation religion as quest (Batson & Ventis, 1982, p. 150).

While the quest concept may be valuable in measuring cognitive approaches to religious issues, it may not be

useful in categorizing individuals into representative types of religiosity in empirical research. Here the concepts of antireligious, humanistic, uncertain, or value conflict may prove to be more useful. The reasoning behind this logic is that when religion is used in research as a dependent variable it is more useful to grasp the extent of religious belief and behavior associated with religious motivation. With regard to religious belief and behavior, the quest dimension is ambiguous. While Batson has referred to the individual within the quest dimension as having a "transcendent dimension to the individual's life" (p. 1150), he does not explain how this individual is religious in any sense. The quest dimension appears to present a confusing picture in this respect.

The data presented by Batson and his colleagues attest to this notion of a "mixed bag" in several respects. Batson developed scales to measure aspects of the intrinsic (which he refers to as "internal"), extrinsic (referred to as "external") and quest (referred to as "interactional") orientations, as well as a scale to measure orthodoxy of beliefs. Correlations between the interactional scale and the intrinsic, extrinsic (both taken from Allport's ROS), external, internal and orthodoxy scales, respectively, have been consistently nonsignificant in research with undergraduates (e.g., Batson & Gray, 1981; Batson, Naifeh &

Pate, 1978; Batson & Ventis, 1982; Batson et al., 1986--- however, this latter study deviated from the others in that the interactional scale was significantly positively correlated with the external scale). Over the same studies, correlations between orthodoxy and the same scales were significantly positive for intrinsic, external and internal scales, however, not for the interactional scale. This indicates that those scoring high on the quest dimension were not consistently adhering to nor consistently rejecting orthodox religious doctrine.

There are twelve items on the orthodoxy scale which reflect American Protestant beliefs, and are assumed by the authors to be generalizable to American Catholics (Batson & Ventis, 1982). Hence, they are basic Christian doctrines. If subjects on the quest dimension are not consistently adhering to orthodox beliefs, then it may be more fruitful to be specific in classifying them as humanistic, agnostic, in value conflict or as extrinsic--- whatever the case may be.

While the quest dimension may reflect a cognitively complex approach to thinking about existential concerns, it does not appear to represent a viable measure of religious orientation per se. It appears, instead, to be a mere measure of cognitive complexity in dealing with existential questions (cf. Batson & Raynor-Prince, 1983).

The research on the quest dimension may relate to the research on moral development in terms of abstracting and independently applying specific cognitive approaches to problems. Whether the intrinsic may or may not apply a higher level of reasoning to certain problems may depend on the amount of adherence to the orthodox doctrines of one's denominational faith in cognitively processing existential problems.

This line of reasoning, in fact, appears to be supported by the significantly negative correlation reported by Batson and Raynor-Prince (1983) between orthodoxy and cognitive complexity in dealing with existential questions. This relationship reflects that the more orthodox one is, the less cognitive complexity there is in dealing with existential concerns. Furthermore, this correlation held up when the effects of sex and general cognitive complexity were removed, whereas the correlation between the interactional scale and cognitive complexity in dealing with existential concerns did not. Hence, it is not a general cognitive complexity that relates to the quest dimension that is being measured and not necessarily a cognitive complexity in dealing with existential concerns. What the quest dimension actually represents is ambiguous at this point.

In an investigation of helping behavior, Batson and Gray (1981) found support for their contention that the end orientation to religion is primarily motivated by an internal need to be helpful regardless of the expressed need of the victim, whereas the quest orientation leads to helping that is responsive to the victim's expressed needs. Batson and his colleagues equate the end orientation with an intrinsic religious orientation (this is consistent throughout all their research).

Briefly, the investigation found a significant correlation between the end orientation and helping, regardless of the victim's expressed needs--- i.e., a help wanted condition or a help not wanted condition. The quest orientation was significantly correlated with helping only in the help wanted condition and significantly correlated with not helping in the help not wanted condition. The means orientation (which Batson and his colleagues equate with the extrinsic religious orientation) was significantly correlated with not helping in the help not wanted condition.

The experimental manipulation consisted of a set of bogus notes from a student, Janet, who was from out-of-town, lived alone, off-campus, had no friends, was lonely, dealt with her problems by drinking (or praying--- these conditions were varied), and wondered if the subject might

be willing to get together with her for coffee. In the help not wanted condition the same story and suggestion to get together was made, but was followed by an expression of wanting to deal with the problem of being alone in a new place by facing up to it on her own.

This study can be criticized in several respects. First of all, the experimental manipulation was poor in that in both the help wanted and the help not wanted conditions Janet actually asked for help. Analysis of the data reported all subjects as perceiving Janet's need as moderately to highly severe, with no significant differences between the two conditions.

Secondly, significant differences were found on subjects' trait ratings of Janet with regard to responsibility and maturity. Furthermore, a post-experimental questionnaire indicated that all subjects took the experiment seriously, with no differences between experimental conditions. However, no analyses were reported to reflect whether the differences in perceiving Janet as more or less responsible and mature could be attributed to a particular religious orientation. Such a difference in perceptions of Janet could account for differences in helping behavior in the help wanted and not wanted conditions (i.e., subjects in the end orientation may have

perceived her as less mature and less responsible, hence, accounting for a higher motivation to help).

Thirdly, the implied equivalence of the end and intrinsic orientations is suspect. Batson and his colleagues imply this equivalence throughout their studies of religious orientation (see studies cited earlier in this section). This may be an unwarranted assumption. In all their work, factor analyses have been run on the six religious orientation scales (extrinsic, intrinsic, external, internal, interactional and orthodoxy) resulting in a three-factor solution: religion as means, end and quest. The end dimension has consistently produced high loadings from the intrinsic, external, internal and orthodoxy scales. The external scale is purported to measure an aspect of extrinsicness--- the influence of the social environment on an individual's personal religiosity. This relates to extrinsicness in that social approval is gained by religious behavior. According to Batson and his colleagues' reasoning, the external scale should be loading highly on their means factor--- and it does not. In fact, their means factor is usually dominated by a single high loading of Allport's extrinsic scale.

Overall, then, it may be that the end factor is not a "pure" measure of intrinsic religiosity. This may also indicate that Batson and Gray's finding the "intrinsic", end

orientation to be motivated by internal needs of the subject, regardless of the expressed needs of the victim, does not hold for intrinsically oriented individuals. In fact, the poor design of the study and omission of relevant additional data may invalidate the findings of their study with regard to helping behavior altogether.

Batson and his colleagues' work has further been criticized regarding its methodology, both statistically (Hilty et al., 1985) and in terms of sample suitability (Spilka et al., 1985). In fact, Hilty et al. suggest that researchers utilizing the religious variable may prefer to use Allport's paradigm of religious orientation rather than Batson's. Hood (1985) also seriously questions Batson's original premise that Allport's concept of intrinsic religiosity neglected to emphasize the notion of uncertainty and doubt in dealing with life's questions. Hood quotes Allport:

We may then say that the mature religious sentiment is ordinarily fashioned in the workshop of doubt. Though it has known intimately "the dark night of the soul," it has decided that theoretical skepticism is not incompatible with practical absolutism. While it knows all the grounds for skepticism, it serenely affirms its wager. In so doing, it finds that the successive acts of commitment, with their beneficent consequences,

slowly strengthen the faith and cause the moments of doubt to disappear (Allport, 1956, pp. 73-74).

Hood emphasizes that Allport's concept of intrinsic religiosity is in all likelihood achieved in later stages one's religious development, after transcending doubt and extrinsic religious motivations. In this sense, Hood indicates that Batson's concept of quest may relate to the developmental sequence involved in becoming intrinsic, i.e., moving from an extrinsic to a questioning/quest stance on to an intrinsic religious commitment. In this sense the quest dimension may be useful.

Social desirability and I-E

Social desirability has been implicated as a confound in self-report measures of religious orientation (Hoge, 1972; Batson & Ventis, 1982; Batson & Raynor-Prince, 1983). Batson and his colleagues especially emphasize that an intrinsic religious orientation may be susceptible to the influence of social desirability.

It has already been mentioned that Watson et al. (1984) reported a significantly positive correlation between those scoring high in intrinsic religious orientation and social desirability. Batson, Naifeh and Pate (1978) also report significant correlations between the intrinsic orientation and social desirability.

Due to these relationships, Batson and his colleagues question the consistent empirical relationships between an intrinsic religious orientation and low prejudice, suggesting they may be an artifact due to social desirability (Batson & Ventis, 1982; Batson et al., 1978). Using a behavioral measure of prejudice, Batson et al. (1978) found that the end orientation was not significantly correlated with prejudice; however, the relationship was positive ($r=0.26$), whereas it had been significantly negative when using a self-report measure of prejudice.

In describing this study in the Batson and Ventis (1982) text, the authors appear to be biased against Allport's conception of the intrinsic orientation and attempt to promote their quest orientation. (It should be noted that the bias in Batson's work with regard to promoting the quest orientation has been perceived by others, e.g., Hood and Morris [1985]. These authors indicate that Batson and his colleagues argue that "quest is best" [p. 392].) For example, in the text they state that the quest orientation in the above study was not significantly related to prejudice. They state that, "This (quest) orientation correlated more negatively with the behavioral measure than either the means ($p<0.10$) or end ($p<0.03$) orientations" (p. 280). It is also noteworthy that they fail to mention that Allport and Ross' measure of

intrinsic religious orientation retained its significantly negative correlation with prejudice even when social desirability was partialled out. This lends further support to the notion that their end orientation (which was not significantly negatively correlated with prejudice when social desirability was partialled out) is not equivalent to an intrinsic orientation.

Further data regarding the relationship between intrinsicness and social desirability is found. In a later study, Watson et al. (1984a) reported that while a significantly positive correlation was found between ROS intrinsic scores and social desirability scores, this relationship did not effect the correlation found between intrinsic religiosity and empathy.

In a later study, Batson et al. (1986) again attempt to show that their quest orientation is associated with displaying less racial prejudice than the intrinsic orientation is. (They found that an intrinsic orientation was significantly negatively correlated with choosing to sit with a white person in the overt prejudice condition, but this correlation was close to zero in the covert condition; the quest orientation was significantly negatively correlated with choosing to sit with the white person in the covert condition. However, the authors appear to have undermined the significance of the finding that the quest

orientation was not significantly correlated with choosing to sit with the white person in the overt prejudice condition.) It is interesting that Batson et al. did not choose to include a measure of social desirability in this investigation.

Spilka et al. (1985) found social desirability (as measured by both the Marlowe-Crowne and Edwards social desirability scales) to be nonsignificantly correlated with intrinsicness, and only one social desirability scale (Marlowe-Crowne) to be significantly negatively correlated with extrinsicness. They found Batson's quest dimension (as measured by his interaction scale) to be significantly negatively correlated with the Edwards scale, and nonsignificant in correlation with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Hunsberger and Platonow (1986) also found intrinsicness to be nonsignificantly related to social desirability (as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale), but extrinsicness was significantly related to social desirability in a positive direction.

However, what is of interest to this author is the significantly positive correlation found between an intrinsic religious orientation and social desirability. This indicates that the influence of social desirability warrants future investigation in measures of religious orientation.

Recent developments in testing I-E

While a few instruments exist to measure religious orientation, no one appears to be universally accepted. As stated earlier in this paper, the original concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity developed by Allport and Ross (1967) are focused on in research in this area. As can be seen in the review of the literature presented in this paper, their ROS also appears to be heavily relied upon in empirical studies utilizing religious orientation as a variable.

Instruments developed by other authors to measure intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity utilize items from the ROS. These instruments are Hoge's Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972) and the Religious Orientation Scale developed by Spilka, Stout, Minton and Sizemore (1977). The majority of items on these scales are from the ROS. While the reliabilities of these scales is acceptable, construct validation is poor.

The construct validity of the Spilka et al. scale essentially relies on its correlations with death perspectives. Hoge's scale relies on a validation study which utilized correlations between minister's judgments of 42 persons thought to be intrinsically or extrinsically oriented. The majority of subjects were Presbyterian. Along with item-to-scale correlations, factor analysis,

based on an N=42, a very poor subject to variable ratio, was also used to aid in item selection for Hoge's scale.

Overall, none of the available measures of religious orientation--- the original ROS, nor Hoge's or Spilka et al.'s scales--- are sufficiently valid for use in empirical research. A more recently developed version of the ROS suffers from this same problem.

Gorsuch and Venable (1983) undertook the development of a religious orientation scale that would be applicable for use with children and adolescents, as well as adults. They rewrote the original ROS items to simplify the language of the scale without changing its content. The rewritten scale is entitled the Age Universal Religious Orientation Scales.

Their investigations showed the Age Universal Religious Orientation Scales to be comparable as an alternate form to the original I and E subscales of the ROS with adults. Coefficient alphas for the new scales were 0.66 for E and 0.73 for I as compared to alphas of 0.70 for E and 0.73 for I on the original scale using the same adult subjects. Correlations between the Age Universal I and E scales were -0.39, and between the original Allport and Ross I and E scales, -0.38.

A sample of 138 fifth graders and 119 seventh graders in a Protestant evangelical school were administered the Age Universal Religious Orientation Scales along with a measure

of verbal ability. Overall alphas of 0.75 for E and 0.68 for I, and a -0.28 correlation between I and E, were obtained on the Age Universal scales for children in the lower to highest levels of verbal ability. There was a significant curvilinear trend that resulted for I alphas across the verbal ability levels. This trend indicated caution in using the scales with children in the lowest verbal ability level. Other than this precaution, the Age Universal Religious Orientation Scales appear to be comparable for use with adults and children down to the fifth grade level. The content of the original ROS restricts rewriting of items at very low readability levels.

The Age Universal scales appear to be promising for research utilizing direct comparisons between children and adults on religious orientation. The new scale is heuristically potent; e.g., research on developmental questions regarding religious orientation could be carried out, and studies involving religious orientation using age universal scales would result in greater generalizability to both children and adults.

While more extensive reliability and validity studies are needed, the preliminary studies reported by Gorsuch and Venable seem promising. However, as with the original ROS, construct validity is lacking (in the original scale it is limited to correlations with prejudice and I or E), and the

focus of attention has been only on two dimensions of religious orientation, namely I and E.

Donahue (1985a, 1985b) recently reviewed the literature on the intrinsic and extrinsic concepts of religious orientation. While several studies have reported reliability coefficients for the ROS which are acceptable (ranging from .91 to .67 for I and .85 to .69 for E), item-total correlations have not fared so well. Regarding validity of the ROS, Donahue (1985a) notes the evidence for concurrent validity of the ROS intrinsic scale (I). Across four studies, I was found to have an average correlation of .76 with measures of religious commitment. The ROS extrinsic scale (E) correlated, on average, .03 with these measures. Donahue indicates that this latter correlation is indicative of discriminant validity for E.

However, the validity of the ROS I has been criticized in that in some of the research the scale appears to be denominationally specific. That is, the ROS has been criticized as useful only with Protestant samples, as it relates to a Southern Baptist type of theology. Use of the ROS with nontraditional and Catholic samples has produced conflicting results (e.g., Strickland & Weddell, 1972; Griffin & Thompson, 1983; Donahue, 1985a; Diegnan & Murray, 1975). Overall, while Donahue's review indicates that the ROS has some indications of concurrent validity for the I

scale, virtually no studies have directly demonstrated nor addressed construct validity for either the ROS I or E scales. The construct validity of the ROS as measuring the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations has merely been assumed over the years.

Another recent development in the measurement of religious orientation is the emergence of the Peck-Terry-Layton (PTL) Scale of Values (Peck, 1983; Terry, 1983). As stated earlier, this instrument appears to be promising in terms of meeting the need for a reliable and valid measure of religious orientation, and further investigation of this instrument is warranted. A separate section follows to present the characteristics of the scale in detail.

The PTL Scale of Values

The Peck-Terry-Layton (PTL) Scale of Values is a scale of religious values developed to assess the degree to which respondents agree-disagree with a number of value statements. The scale provides a multidimensional measure of religious orientation which assesses the values of individuals that are conceptualized as motivating religious beliefs and behavior. The PTL was constructed to serve as a psychometrically valid measure of religiosity for use in empirical research utilizing religiosity as a variable.

Preliminary data on the PTL indicate that the instrument can reliably discriminate four religious

orientations: Intrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict, Egocentrism with Hostility and Extrinsic Religiosity. Definitions of these orientations will be presented following an overview of the construction and psychometric characteristics of the scale.

The instrument originally consisted of a total of 72 items utilizing a five-point Likert-type response scale. The internal consistency for the total scale, using coefficient alpha, was 0.84. This was computed on 219 undergraduates from Iowa State University who received extra credit in psychology classes for participation. Data as to sex were obtained for 177 subjects (94 males, 83 females). It was assumed that subjects were fairly homogeneous with regard to age and education.

The PTL was submitted to factor analysis (principal components method with Varimax rotation) and four factors emerged. The four dimensions were labelled Intrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict, Egocentrism with Hostility and Extrinsic Religiosity. These dimensions are considered as subscales of the PTL.

The items that loaded highest on each factor and low on remaining factors (i.e., less than 0.30) were chosen as representing factorially "pure" measures of that factor. These items were retained as representative of the four subscales of the PTL. The reliabilities of the subscales,

as measured by coefficient alpha, are as follows: Intrinsic Religiosity 0.90 (11 items), Value Conflict 0.69 (8 items), Egocentrism with Hostility 0.66 (6 items), and Extrinsic Religiosity 0.59 (5 items). Of the eleven items on the Intrinsic Religiosity subscale, three are from the ROS. Of the five items on the Extrinsic Religiosity subscale, four are from the ROS.

The subscales were correlated, based on factor scores, as follows: Intrinsic Religiosity was negatively correlated with Egocentrism with Hostility (-0.26 , $p < 0.01$), Value Conflict was negatively correlated with Egocentrism with Hostility (-0.18 , $p < 0.01$), and Value Conflict was positively correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity (0.24 , $p < 0.01$). Egocentrism with Hostility represents a bipolar factor, and is purported to reflect a humanistic and religiously liberal flavor at its opposite pole.

Analysis of the PTL included an investigation of its relationship to authoritarianism and several biographical data items. Ray's (1976) short balanced F scale served as a measure of authoritarianism. From the analyses, definitions of the subscales evolved. The four subscales are purported to represent four religious orientations. Definitions of each orientation and preliminary construct validation of each subscale will now be presented.

Intrinsic religiosity

The Intrinsic Religiosity subscale reflects individuals who are on a continuum of religious orientation which varies from a high intrinsic religious motivation on one end to having a lack of intrinsic religious motivation on the other. God and religious beliefs play an important, highly personal, motivating role in the daily existence of the individual who is intrinsically religiously motivated. These individuals reflect the essence of Allport's intrinsic religious orientation. The instrumental aspect of such a religious stance, in which faith is an integral, intimate and primary motivation in life, represents a striving toward a unification of being which transcends a materially-oriented, "here and now" existence. The intrinsically motivated individual's religious faith has the flavor of a personally invigorating and almost life-giving aspect to his or her being, which is introjected from the embodiment of a religious stance.

The opposite end of this factor reflects the stance of one who rejects the notion of religion and belief in God as being personally relevant. A religious orientation may be seen as irrelevant, fictitious and possibly damaging to one's selfhood and one's way of being in the world.

The interpretation of this factor, as suggested by the items with high factor loadings, adds credence to the notion

that an intrinsic religious motivation is distinct from an extrinsic religious motivation: intrinsicness is evidenced as constituting one extreme of a factor which measures the degree of religiosity one holds.

The following correlational findings with the other orientations and biographical data items lend some support to the construct validity of Intrinsic Religiosity. The Intrinsic Religiosity factor was negatively correlated with the Egocentrism with Hostility factor. It was not correlated with Value Conflict or Extrinsic Religiosity; neither was it correlated with sex nor with the authoritarianism scores. (Recall that the literature substantiates intrinsicness as being correlated with characteristics of tolerance versus prejudice.) Intrinsic Religiosity was also correlated with affirmation of church membership/body of believers in God, high frequency of worship service attendance, frequent Bible study attendance, frequent participation in church social functions, and frequent participation in prayer meetings. The expectations that one may hold for an intrinsic religious motivation as defined by Allport have been borne out in this study in terms of the responses to biographical data items.

Further support for the attribute of an intrinsic religious orientation being measured by this factor was indicated by loadings of items from the ROS. Three of the

items taken from Allport's intrinsic religious orientation subscale were among the highest loadings on this factor. Two of these which were keyed as intrinsic had high positive loadings, and the third, which was negatively worded and thus keyed as extrinsic, had a high negative loading. The other items from his extrinsic subscale loaded negatively or not at all on this factor.

Value conflict

The Value Conflict subscale represents individuals who vary on a continuum of holding the self as a referent and as a stabilizing point for decision-making concerning value-laden issues. One end of the continuum reflects the individual who is self-assured, unconflicted, sensitive and responsive to his or her own valuational ideologies. This individual is able to achieve closure in circumstances which entail values.

The other end of the continuum is postulated to reflect one who is experiencing a discrepancy in valuational systems and/or ideations which have resulted from opposing internal and external values. The internal forces emanating from the self-as-reference are weak, diffused or not solicitously attended to. They are not the primary source of reference in considering one's stance concerning values. Forces external to the self are perceived as having equal or superior power relative to one's own personal power in

dictating a stance on value issues. When these external forces impinge on the individual in interaction with the weaker internal forces, the self no longer serves as a stable reference point able to exact a stand on value-laden issues. Closure on such matters is not achieved, and the instability and lack of internal resolve remain to haunt the individual.

The clash of internal and external perspectives creates a state of ambivalence, confusion or unresolvedness which may result in condemnation for behaviors performed or not performed. If present to a noticeable, although not particularly uncomfortable, degree, the individual may seek to lessen the discomfort created by the discrepancy through becoming unconscientious in situations entailing valuational issues. The individual in more extreme value conflict, however, is ultimately ineffective in adopting such a defense. The absence of a homeostatic state in his or her conscience with regard to values is increasingly discomfitting, and the conflict created by the internal and external forces eventually emerges and is overtly expressed as an experience of value conflict as his or her system is overloaded.

Correlational data evidenced that those individuals who are high in value conflict subscribe to church membership/belief in God and are related to an extrinsic

religious motivation. These individuals are not frequently attending church, nor are they frequently participating in other church-related activities, as indicated by the nonsignificant correlations with the other biographical data items (i.e., Bible study, church social functions and prayer meetings). While such individuals subscribe to holding membership in a body of believers in God, they tend not to be actively involved in the faith as evidenced by other biographical data items. It is postulated that such individuals do not act on the basic tenets of their religious beliefs in everyday living.

These individuals' lack of resolve to identify with and internalize the basic tenets of religious belief and/or faith is quite possibly the precipitating factor in creating a state of imbalance in valuational orientations. It is assumed that since these individuals subscribe to church membership/believership they are familiar with the basic tenets of the Judeo-Christian faith; however, it is further hypothesized that their belief systems are not utilized in a consistent fashion to base decisions on, nor are these belief systems used as an overall mode of reacting to the world. For example, if the basic tenets of the Judeo-Christian faith such as brotherly love and a sense of individual worth and value in God's eyes have not been internalized and operationalized in dealings with everyday

life, the individual may react with feelings of jealousy, interpersonal competitiveness and/or resentment in various situations in an attempt to rectify his or her own "worthiness". Subsequently, conflict over such reactions may be experienced, as these feelings are generally unacceptable in terms of social mores which run parallel to, and are derived from, such Judeo-Christian ethics. They are, therefore, subject to a discrepancy in valuational ideologies, especially in persons sensitive toward perceived imbalances, weak and unresolved in value orientations. The result is an experienced state of value conflict.

The Value Conflict subscale was not found to be correlated with the authoritarianism scale, nor with sex. A lack of Value Conflict was found to indicate Egocentrism with Hostility. This relationship will be discussed in the following section.

Egocentrism with hostility

The Egocentrism with Hostility subscale represents those individuals who vary on a dimension which reflects the degree to which the person is both egocentric and hostile. At one extreme, this dimension expresses the degree to which one is self-centered, uncaring and vengeful. This individual has a lack of conscience, he or she has problems with interpersonal relationships, denying a closeness or intimacy of relationships. The flavor of the sociopathic

personality is reflected here. The indignant, self-righteous and hostile flavor of this individual appears to be a defensive reaction serving as a self-protective device. This person is thus insensitive to the feelings of others, would tend to hurt others before being hurt himself or herself, and tends to distance the self from others. This individual can essentially be characterized as "looking out for number one". The wants, needs and desires of the self are first and foremost in motivating this individual to action and to reaction in situations where self-centered interests are aborted. This individual's belief system essentially revolves around belief in the self versus belief in God/religion.

At the other extreme of this bipolar dimension is the individual who lacks an egocentric, hostile personality. This pole is labelled Humanitarianism and is conceptualized as reflecting a humanitarian religious orientation. A need for reconciliation and reestablishment of interpersonal relationships is expressed. Self-centered interests and motives are denied. This individual is sensitive toward others. Valuation of the other, as well as the self, is maintained. The primary impetus toward caring, sharing, fairness/equity and lack of hostility is provided by the conscience. The individual on this end of the dimension tends to subscribe to altruistic values. Such altruistic

values are held in high esteem and are of central importance. Inspection of the items reflected that these individuals are sensitive toward and tolerant of others.

As evidenced via correlations with other data, those lacking in Egocentrism with Hostility tend to share some values with those who are of an intrinsic religious motivation; they are church members, may believe in God, tend to attend Bible studies and church social functions and are not authoritarian. However, these individuals are not frequently attending worship services, nor are they likely to attend prayer meetings. These individuals appear to reflect a more humanistic or religiously liberal orientation.

The humanitarian religious orientation, though in some respects similar to the intrinsic religious orientation, is conceptualized as separate and distinct from the intrinsic orientation. The humanitarian individual does not hold to religious values in the traditional sense. While humanitarian value systems may be considered to be religious in a transcendent sense, they are not orthodox religious beliefs that are accepted by faith and stem from the traditional notion of an Almighty God.

Basically, what separates the humanitarian type from the intrinsically religious type is the assumption that religious (and other) values and beliefs are logically

chosen and not accepted by faith. The humanitarian is motivated by a rational decision to adhere to a specific set of principles, be they religiously or secularly based. For the humanitarian, the basis of religious motivation lies in the mental realm, whereas the basis of religious motivation for the intrinsic can be said to lie in the spiritual realm. In this manner, God and religious beliefs are essentially subjugated to secular humanistic beliefs. It is in this sense that the religious values of the humanitarian might be considered as religious in a transcendent sense.

In contrast to the intrinsic, of major value for the humanitarian is the quality of life in the here-and-now versus the hereafter. The meaning of life is primarily sought after in the present, as belief in a life after death is considered to be secondary, irrelevant or nonexistent. Therefore, these persons may be best characterized as religiously liberal, and may be agnostic or atheistic.

In contrast, interest in religion as a personal commitment is not found among those high in Egocentrism with Hostility. This was evidenced by the negative correlations with church membership/body of believers in God and Intrinsic Religiosity. Persons high in Egocentrism with Hostility as a rule, never attend church social functions, and shy away from Bible studies. This was seen in the respective negative correlations with these biographical

items. There was no correlation with scores on this subscale and frequency of involvement in worship services and prayer meetings. This indicates that there are some individuals who are egocentric and hostile and yet do attend church services and do pray. These may be those who are also experiencing a certain amount of value conflict over their actions. Egocentrism with Hostility was correlated with Value Conflict. Hence, religion may be used in an attempt to appease the conscience; further study may reveal, e.g., that as a result of attending church the individual is exposed to valuational messages that conflict with self-held notions concerning modes of acting in the world. However, it must be emphasized that the foregoing was based on extrapolation of the data, and is offered hypothetically to suggest future research inquiring into the characteristics of those conflicted in values.

Those high in Egocentrism with Hostility experience no remorse or conflict with the conscience. There tends to be a lack of conscience in these persons. They represent those who utilize the self as a base of reference in valuational systems, holding to the self and its needs and interests as the primary focus. Those individuals who are high in Egocentrism with Hostility are low in Value Conflict, and hence, tend to hold the same characteristics as these individuals, especially with regard to obtaining closure in

valuational situations. There is no conflict concerning values--- the primary value is the self.

Egocentrism with Hostility was found to be correlated with authoritarianism scores. It was also correlated with being male. Authoritarian attitudes of intolerance, aggressiveness and rigidity are reflected in this factor. Along with its negative correlations with Intrinsic Religiosity, this finding provided some construct validation for this subscale.

Extrinsic religiosity

The Extrinsic Religiosity subscale expresses the degree to which the individual views the primary value of religion as instrumental in the service of the self. At one extreme of this dimension, the individual subscribes to such values as faith, prayer, fellowship, justice and morality. Such principles are expounded with the facade of being valuable in their own right, while self interests, such as one's own security and welfare predominantly underlie the holding of these valuational orientations. This is the essence of Allport's extrinsic religious orientation, where religious values are held for their utilitarian aspects.

The other extreme of this dimension reflects a lack of extrinsic religious orientation. Here the individual is holding to religious values not so much for their utilitarian aspects as for the intent of providing some sort

of structure to life. One possibility, e.g., may be an orientation to subscribe to values of religion, prayer, faith, "Samaritanism", justice and morality for tradition's sake. However, speculation on the lack of Extrinsic Religiosity remains just that--- speculation--- at this point; although, there is a general denial of the self-centered, utilitarian aspect of religion at this end of the dimension.

Individuals high in extrinsic religious motivation who are using religious affiliation as a tool toward self-centered ends tend to be high in value conflict, as indicated by the correlation between Value Conflict and Extrinsic Religiosity. These individuals are sensitive to and in tune with the "social" value of religious values, and tend to use this information in service of the self (e.g., going to church to make business contacts). Hence, a discrepancy would be expected to exist between the facade of self-held values as presented to the world and the internal values held by the self. It is postulated that those who use religion to a high degree for selfish purposes and are experiencing a high degree of value conflict are those individuals who are more actively involved in church doings. Hence, a sense of conscience would emerge to create the experienced value conflict.

However, a significant correlation between Extrinsic Religiosity and affirmation of church membership/ believership, frequency of worship service attendance, Bible study, prayer meeting or church social attendance was not found in the preliminary investigation. According to Allport's description of the extrinsic religious orientation, the extrinsic is expected to hold some of these characteristics.

A possible explanation for the nonsignificant correlations found between those persons with a propensity toward an extrinsic religious motivation and the above characteristics of church/religious involvement can be offered. Batson and Ventis (1982), discussing the sociopsychological influences on religious behavior, point out that the effect of attending college or university has a negative impact on individuals' endorsement of orthodox religious beliefs. Their explanation is in terms of the shifts in reference groups encountered in a university setting. The shift is toward less orthodox beliefs. Ties with home-based reference groups (e.g., parental influence) are weakened and ties with academic reference groups are strengthened. The latter typically ascribe to more liberal, skeptical religious attitudes. Students in the social and behavioral sciences are indicated to be most prone to social pressure toward adopting religious skepticism, followed by

individuals in other academic areas. Interestingly enough, such attitudes are likely to change once the individual leaves the university setting, and empirical support for such change is evidenced by Feldman and Newcomb (1969), as cited in Batson and Ventis (1982).

It would seem that the sample of college undergraduates in the preliminary investigation who are of the extrinsic ilk would be more susceptible to the aforementioned shift toward religious skepticism and nonendorsement of religious behavior than those who are intrinsically motivated. Individuals with internalized intrinsic religious values, which provide a motivational basis for acting on such beliefs in everyday life, should be less influenced by social pressure to conform in university and other settings. This may account for the significant correlations that were found between Intrinsic Religiosity and biographical data items concerning religious behaviors (e.g., endorsing church membership/believership, attending worship services, etc.) and the nonsignificant correlations that were found between Extrinsic Religiosity and those biographical data items in the preliminary investigation.

It should be reemphasized here that a significantly positive correlation was found between Value Conflict and Extrinsic Religiosity. Assuming that the extrinsics were from a basically extrinsic religious orientation, this

correlation lends further credence to the above interpretation of the findings. It would be expected that those individuals, upon returning to the community with new roles, a new set of norms and a new set of reference groups, would likely change their religious beliefs and/or behaviors accordingly to those that would be expected from a cross section of extrinsically religiously oriented adults.

The above thoughts raise the question as to whether the Value Conflict factor found in the preliminary study was a function of the particular sample used. Could this factor have been produced as a result of extrinsically oriented students' shift in reference groups and norms? There is also the question of the Egocentrism with Hostility factor being a function of the group used in this sample. For example, scores on several scales of the MMPI are related to demographic variables, among them that of education, and specific adjustments in interpretation are recommended for college education and being a college student (Greene, 1980). It is a possibility then, that this factor, also, may be specific to the population of college students and/or young adults in general. For many students, college is the first experience of independence from parental authority, and many may yet hold rebellious attitudes in an effort to break the ties with family and the establishment in an attempt to "find themselves". Future work on the PTL would,

of necessity, include sampling of other, noncollege populations.

Extrinsic Religiosity was correlated with authoritarianism. Adorno found authoritarian attitudes to be correlated with what he termed "neutralized religion", referring here to subordination of religion to self-centered aims, and a weakening of religious beliefs in a rigid, yet rather unconscientious fashion (Adorno et al., 1950). Authoritarian attitudes of the tendency to acquiesce to authority and regard it highly, a need for clear structure, rigidity in thinking and adherence to conventional, middle class values may characterize the extrinsic individual. Thus, in line with previous investigations which have reported an extrinsic religious orientation to be associated with many authoritarian characteristics (Laaser, 1981; Kahoe, 1974; Brannon, 1970; Allport & Ross, 1967; Feagin, 1964; Photiadis & Biggar, 1962), preliminary data on the PTL fall into suit.

In conclusion, preliminary data indicate some support for the validity of the PTL as a measure of religious orientation. As it stands, the PTL has respectable reliability coefficients overall and in terms of its subscales. In terms of present evidence for reliability and validity, the PTL appears comparable to existing measures of

religious orientation. Further work on the scale is certainly warranted.

In terms of future work, the reliabilities of the overall scale and the subscales of Value Conflict, Egocentrism with Hostility and Extrinsic Religiosity could be increased. Sampling of non-college populations is also called for to determine if the subscales will generalize across demographic groups. However, at this point in the scale's development, the next logical step appears to this author to be an investigation of construct validation. The reliabilities of the subscales appear to be robust enough at present, and, while they could be increased, it makes intuitive sense to first ascertain that the orientations reflect the essence of what they are purported to measure. Hence, the present study is proposed to investigate this aspect of the PTL.

The heuristic and potential applicability of the PTL as a measure of religious orientation seems apparent in view of the literature reviewed in this paper. The importance and relevance of such an instrument will be highlighted in a brief summary of the literature review.

Summary of the Literature on I-E

A review of the historical background of psychological perspectives on religion reveals that contrary and contrasting positions on the value of religion have

traditionally existed. These opposing views continue into the present, and are perhaps inevitable. However, in psychology we should not be guided by personal opinion to determine the potential impact of a variable.

While it is probably true that some forms or uses of religion may be harmful to a person's mental health, or to society in general, we need to identify which forms of religion, or which ways of being religious, are the culprits. Traditional empirical research utilizing a unidimensional perspective on religion has supported a generally negative view of the religious person which continues to exist among professionals in psychology to date. The bias, neglect and negativism toward religion as a variable have been reviewed and identified as stemming in part from the attitudinal and conceptual biases of professionals, and the personality and religiosity measures utilized in research on this variable. Inadequate measures of religiosity which represent a unidimensional perspective of religion appear to this author to be a major shortcoming in research utilizing religion as a variable.

The literature reveals that when a multidimensional perspective toward religiosity is taken, many of the negative characteristics of religion as a variable disappear. A consideration of the different ways of being religious appears to be an important and heuristically

potent approach to research on the subject-matter. This perspective, along with the current resurgence of interest in religion among professionals in psychology, appears to be leading to new insight into the impact of religiosity on human functioning.

Much of the recent work utilizing a multidimensional perspective on religion is based on Allport's conception of religious orientation and the dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. The importance of these dimensions has been borne out empirically and will be highlighted here.

Many personality correlates have been found to be related to religious orientation. Intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of religious orientation have been found to discriminate between individuals high and low on such characteristics as prejudice, rigidity, suspicion and personal immaturity. Religious orientation has been implicated as a variable in social adjustment, ego strength, emotional stability, empathy, trust and rational thinking.

Religious orientation has consistently been associated with locus of control, with those scoring as intrinsics having an internal locus of control, and those scoring as extrinsics having an external locus of control.

Implications have been made that religious orientation may influence the development of narcissism, and is related to the self-concept, purpose in life, attitudes toward death

and existential anxiety. Involvement of religious orientation in behaviors such as responsibility, grade-point average, helping behavior and moral judgment have also been supported in the literature. Furthermore, value systems, work values, susceptibility to attitude change and social desirability have also been found to be correlates of religious orientation.

The value of considering the religious variable in clinical practice has just begun to be explored in relation to increasing the efficiency of techniques when working with persons who hold a religious perspective. The need for more information concerning the role of religion in therapeutic endeavors, as well as elsewhere in human functioning, is evident. If an instrument that could reliably and validly assess religiosity were available for general use, more knowledge about the effect of religion on persons in general, on clients, counselors, counselor-client dyads, etc., will be gained. The practical value of such knowledge is apparent, e.g., in training and research areas. A prime example of the potential benefits to be gained from such knowledge is more information on the specificity of the counseling relationship in identifying counselor/client characteristics that may be indicators of efficacious process and outcome. Other areas of benefit include amelioration of the potentially misleading results of

personality measures, and insight into developmental aspects of human functioning, e.g., in terms of the self-concept, moral judgment, attitudes toward death, existential anxiety and other personality phenomena.

The author of this paper agrees with the assertion of Hunt and King (1971) that intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of religious orientation are personality variables, and believes that they are influential personality variables. The construct of religious orientation may, in fact, be a key variable in drawing together some previously investigated influencers of behavior into a nomological net that may prove useful in the explanation and prediction of behavior.

The present state of the research on religious orientation can be described as one of empirical emergence. The definition of religious orientation as specified by Allport has dominated the research, as has its operationalization via the Religious Orientation Scale. Allport's I-E concept has been valuable heuristically. Its future will depend on the development of better measurement techniques and its further conceptual validation and refinement.

In 1971, Hunt and King issued the call for more specific and complex measures of religion as a variable, and this plea has been repeated twelve years later in a recent

article by Bergin (1983). No one instrument has been accepted as a universal measure of religious orientation, and the few scales that do exist are found to be lacking.

The PTL Scale of Values was developed in an attempt to meet the need for better measurement techniques in the area of religiosity. The PTL appears to be a psychometrically sound and promising measure of religious motivation. It represents a functional approach to measuring religion as a variable, and may prove to surpass existing instruments of religious orientation in terms of psychometric standards of excellence. It is the purpose of the present investigation to further explore the PTL and ascertain the validity of the instrument. Furthermore, it is hoped that new insight into the conceptualization of religious orientation will be gained along the way.

The PTL will be submitted to further construct validation on a sample of individuals from the local community. Nominations of individuals who fit the categories of religious orientation will be obtained. Relationships of the four orientations to the variables of authoritarianism, social desirability, the original ROS and several biographical data items will also be explored.

Hypotheses

1. Subjects nominated by their respective clergy as intrinsically religiously oriented will score higher on the
-

Intrinsic Religiosity subscale of the PTL than those who are nominated as extrinsically oriented or in value conflict.

2. Subjects nominated by their respective clergy as extrinsically religiously oriented will score higher on the Extrinsic Religiosity subscale of the PTL than those who are nominated as intrinsically oriented or in value conflict.

3. Subjects nominated by their respective clergy as in value conflict will score higher on the Value Conflict subscale of the PTL than those who are nominated as intrinsically or extrinsically oriented.

4. Subjects nominated as humanitarian will score higher on the Humanitarianism subscale of the PTL than those nominated as intrinsic, extrinsic or in value conflict.

5. Subjects from a religiously liberal church will score higher on the Humanitarianism subscale of the PTL than will subjects from more traditional churches.

6. The Intrinsic Religiosity scores of subjects who are nominated by the clergy as representative of intrinsics will be less correlated with high scores on the social desirability subscale (MC-20) than will the respective scores of subjects nominated as representative of Extrinsic Religiosity, Value conflict and the Humanitarianism scores of subjects from a religiously liberal church.

7. Extrinsic Religiosity scores of subjects who are nominated by the clergy as representative of extrinsics will

be correlated with high scores on the authoritarianism measure, whereas the respective scores of subjects nominated as representative of Intrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict and the Humanitarianism scores of subjects from a religiously liberal church will not.

8. High scores on the Intrinsic Religiosity subscale of the PTL will be associated with subjects scoring as intrinsic on the ROS.

9. Age will not be correlated with religious orientation, social desirability or authoritarianism.

10. Sex will not be correlated with religious orientation, social desirability or authoritarianism.

11. Affirmation of church membership will be positively correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity, and negatively correlated with Value Conflict and Humanitarianism.

12. Frequency of church attendance will be correlated with Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity, and uncorrelated with Value Conflict and Humanitarianism.

13. Bible study attendance will be positively correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity and negatively correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict and Humanitarianism.

14. Church social function attendance will be positively correlated with Extrinsic and Intrinsic

Religiosity, and negatively correlated with Value Conflict and Humanitarianism.

15. Prayer meeting attendance will be positively correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity and negatively correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict and Humanitarianism.

16. Frequency of prayer will be positively correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity and negatively correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict and Humanitarianism.

17. Place of prayer (any place, any time) will be positively correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity, and negatively correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity, Humanitarianism and Value Conflict.

METHOD

Subjects

Approximately 200 adults nominated by clergypersons (and this author in the case of the humanitarian nominations) of different denominations in the Ames area were asked to complete the PTL Scale of Values, the accompanying biographical data sheet, measures of authoritarianism, social desirability and the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS; Allport & Ross, 1967). Demographic data consisting of sex, age, religious affiliation, and education were requested.

Instruments

The Peck-Terry-Layton (PTL) Scale of Values (Peck, 1983; Terry, 1983) is a scale of religious values designed to assess the degree to which respondents agree-disagree with a number of value statements. The scale provides a multidimensional measure of religious orientation.

The instrument originally consisted of a total of 72 items utilizing a five-point Likert-type response scale. The internal consistency for the total scale was 0.84 (coefficient alpha), as computed on 219 undergraduates of Iowa State University. Data as to sex were obtained for 177 subjects (94 males, 83 females). It was assumed that subjects were homogeneous with regard to age and education.

The PTL was submitted to factor analysis (principal components method with Varimax rotation) and four factors emerged. The items that loaded high on each factor and low on remaining factors (i.e., less than 0.30) were chosen as representing factorially "pure" measures of that factor. These items were retained as representative of the four dimensions and are considered as subscales of the PTL: Intrinsic Religiosity, Extrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict and Egocentrism with Hostility (a bipolar factor which is purported to represent Humanitarianism at its opposite pole). The reliabilities of the subscales, as measured by coefficient alpha, are as follows: Intrinsic Religiosity, 0.90 (11 items); Value Conflict, 0.69 (8 items); Egocentrism with Hostility, 0.66 (6 items); and Extrinsic Religiosity, 0.59 (5 items). Of the eleven items on the Intrinsic Religiosity subscale, three are from the ROS. Of the five items on the Extrinsic Religiosity subscale, four are from the ROS.

The subscales were correlated, based on factor scores, as follows: Intrinsic Religiosity was negatively correlated with Egocentrism with Hostility (-0.026 , $p < 0.01$), Value Conflict was negatively correlated with Egocentrism with Hostility (-0.18 , $p < 0.01$) and positively correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity (0.24 , $p < 0.01$).

The accompanying biographical data sheet includes items requesting the subjects' affirmation of church membership; belief in God; frequency of worship service, Bible study, church social function and prayer meeting attendance; preference for secular or lay counseling; present religious denomination; denomination raised in; affirmation of church membership; education; sex and age.

Ray's (1976) short balanced F scale, an authoritarianism measure, was also administered. This scale is based on the work of Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford (1950) with regard to the authoritarian personality. The scale has a reliability of 0.80 (coefficient alpha) and a split-half reliability (before reversals) of -0.504. The psychometric characteristics of the scale are based on a pool of 200 Australian subjects, randomly selected from a pool of more than 4000 respondents.

A short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, the M-C (20) (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) was also administered (also referred to as the MC-20). This instrument is purported to reflect individuals who describe themselves in favorable, socially desirable terms in order to achieve the approval of others. Internal consistency for this 20 item scale is reported to range from 0.73 to 0.83 (Kuder-Richardson 20).

The Religious Orientation Scale (Allport & Ross, 1967) was also administered. The scale consists of 20 items reflecting intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Scores may also be calculated for antireligious and proreligious orientations. The authors reported item-to-scale correlations ranging from 0.18 to 0.58. Feagin (1964) noted item-to-scale correlations ranging from 0.22 to 0.54. The primary method utilized by Allport to demonstrate construct validity consisted of finding intrinsic religious orientation scores to be less correlated with racial prejudice than extrinsic scores. As noted earlier in this paper, this finding has been replicated in other investigations.

Seven items from the ROS are included in the PTL, hence, they will be represented only once on the questionnaire. All of the ROS items, except two, which are included at the end of the questionnaire in the present study, are to be responded to on a five point Likert scale instead of the four point scale originally used on the ROS. This change is to keep responding as consistent as possible for subjects.

The ROS is scored in a manner similar to the scoring method utilized by Allport and Ross (1967). Allport and Ross found that those who score high on their intrinsic scale do not necessarily score low on their extrinsic scale

(the correlation between the scales is low). To account for the fact that subjects score variably on both scales, and to appropriately represent the dimensions of religious orientation, Allport and Ross used the following criteria for assigning cases to a religious orientation:

Consistently Intrinsic Type: these individuals agree with intrinsically worded items on the intrinsic subscale and disagree with extrinsically worded items on the extrinsic subscale.

Consistently Extrinsic Type: these individuals agree with extrinsically worded items on the extrinsic subscale and disagree with intrinsically worded items on the intrinsic subscale.

The use of the notion of consistently intrinsic and extrinsic types is important in developing a measure that can represent these religious orientations in varying degrees along respective continuums.

There has been confusion regarding the issue of whether the intrinsic and extrinsic scales of the ROS represent one continuous bipolar dimension, or whether they represent two independent continuous dimensions (see Hunt & King, 1969 for a review). According to Allport and Ross, the ROS may be scored as one continuous measure or as two separate scales. However, when scoring the ROS as two separate scales, Allport and Ross utilized median scores to discriminate high

and low intrinsic and extrinsic scores in their determination of which cases qualified as representative of consistently intrinsic and/or consistently extrinsic orientations.

The use of median scores has been criticized as inappropriate, since this results in ambiguous classifications depending on the particular sample and study in use (i.e., different samples present with different means and standard deviations) (Gorsuch, 1984). For this reason, the present investigation deviated from Allport and Ross' scoring method in that the median was not utilized to categorize intrinsic and extrinsic scores.

The present investigation scored the ROS as one continuous scale (i.e., concomitantly scoring intrinsic and extrinsic items to arrive at one subscale score). This represents the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of the ROS along one bipolar continuum. The intrinsic subscale is keyed high and the extrinsic subscale is keyed low. Thus, high intrinsic scores are concomitantly low extrinsic scores, and high extrinsic scores are concomitantly low intrinsic scores. This parallels the method used by Allport and Ross to categorize those representative of the consistently intrinsic and extrinsic types (as set forth in the above criteria).

This scoring method takes into consideration the fact that subjects may agree with both intrinsic and extrinsic items, or disagree with both types of items, or agree with intrinsic items and disagree with extrinsic items, etc. In this manner, the two poles of the continuum represent the consistently intrinsic and consistently extrinsic orientations as set forth by Allport and Ross (1967). Such a representation of consistent intrinsic and extrinsic types is useful for validating the respective PTL subscales as capable of measuring these religious orientations.

Since the purpose of including the ROS as a measure in the present study is to validate the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the PTL, scoring for pro- and antireligious categories on the ROS is disregarded. These orientations are also viewed by this author as somewhat suspect, as, definitionally, they are vague (because they are in actuality representing response set biases perhaps more so than religious orientations per se-- these latter orientations are also difficult to score since the use of median scores is necessitated to represent them along a continuum). Therefore, pro- and antireligious orientations are not addressed for the purposes of the present investigation.

Items from the above four scales were interspersed at random to constitute one total questionnaire. Biographical

data items appear at the end of the questionnaire, as do the two ROS items which do not fit the Likert scale response format. One ROS item is used as a biographical data item. A copy of the questionnaire indicating items from the four measures respectively is provided in Appendix A.

Procedure

Clergypersons representing different denominations were contacted in the Ames, Iowa area to solicit their help in nominating members of their respective churches to participate in the study. The clergy were met with by this author and the concept of religious orientation and descriptions of the intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian orientations were discussed in detail. This was to ascertain that the clergy had an understanding of the concepts involved. A number of different denominations is sampled to represent a mixture of religious denominations. This will take into account the variations that exist between subjects of various religious orientations with regard to person and religious setting variables.

Setting variables that may differ across denominations are, e.g., availability of church functions such as Bible studies, prayer meetings, church social functions, worship services, etc. Expectations for attendance at such functions and amount of involvement in the church/religious setting may vary across inter- and intradenominational

settings. In this respect it is noted that the humanitarian religious orientation is represented by a subsample of the Unitarian denomination (which was solicited by a research assistant at a local Unitarian Fellowship service) as well as those nominated by clergy as representative of humanitarians of more traditional religious denominations. The Unitarian-Universalist denomination is reputed to be representative of those who are nontraditional in religious beliefs and reflective of a humanistic type of religiosity (Miller, 1976; Tapp, 1971). They are therefore assumed to represent a religiously liberal group in this study.

The humanitarian type is assumed to exist in both traditional and nontraditional (or religiously liberal) denominational settings. Utilization of both types of denominational settings for the humanitarian subsample is assumed to represent a mixture of setting variables that may exist for this religious type. This is especially cogent regarding evaluations of the relationship of humanitarian types with variables of interest such as attendance at Bible studies, prayer meetings, etc., in which availability and expectations for attendance may vary across denominations. Nominations were sought to represent the humanitarian end only of the Humanitarianism/Egocentrism with Hostility dimension in order to establish this pole more clearly as a specific religious orientation.

Clergypersons were provided with descriptions of the religious orientations represented on the PTL: Intrinsic Religiosity, Value Conflict, Humanitarianism (which is the opposite pole of Egocentrism with Hostility) and Extrinsic Religiosity. Copies of the descriptions provided to clergypersons are provided in Appendix B.

The anonymity of respondents was assured by the clergy handling dissemination of questionnaires and instructions accompanying the questionnaire which explicitly state that no names be used on the questionnaire/answer sheet. The names and addresses of respondents are unknown to this experimenter. Answer sheets color-coded for each dimension and denomination were utilized. Respondents were asked to anonymously return completed questionnaires to their respective church secretaries where they were collected by this experimenter or an assistant within two to three weeks of dissemination.

A cover letter accompanied each questionnaire briefly explaining the nature of the research and the aid of the respective clergy in disseminating questionnaires. Anonymity and complete confidentiality of responses is emphasized. Instructions accompanied each questionnaire.

The dilemma with regard to follow-up and return rate that is inherent in assuring complete confidentiality, the demand characteristics associated with involvement of the

clergy in disseminating and collecting questionnaires, and the anonymity of the respondents to this experimenter is recognized. However, the anonymity of respondents to this experimenter and to clergy was felt to be of great importance in assuring confidentiality of responses as well as frankness in responding. It is assumed that this procedure will outweigh the potential negative effects inherent in the association of the questionnaire with the church and clergy. The emphasis on the confidentiality, anonymity of responses and purpose of the research should lessen these latter demand characteristics.

RESULTS

There were a total of 170 questionnaires returned:

31 Roman Catholic

20 Lutheran

68 First Evangelical

31 Ames Christian Fellowship

20 Unitarian

(Two cases were deleted because they were lacking a nomination.) With regard to nominations as to religious orientation:

72 were nominated as Intrinsic

21 were nominated as Extrinsic

36 were nominated as Value Conflict

41 were nominated as Humanitarian

Of the 41 Humanitarian nominees, 21 were nominated as in this category by clergy and 20 were nominated by this author to reflect this category.

It should be noted that only the pastor of the First Evangelical Free Church nominated any subjects as extrinsic. The nominations according to denomination are found in Table 1a.

Overall scores (i.e., regardless of nomination) for each of the 7 subscales were calculated. The authoritar-

ianism, social desirability (MC-20) and PTL Value Conflict subscales are keyed for low scorers. Scores on these subscales are fairly normally distributed. The Humanitarianism subscale is keyed for high scorers. Scores on this subscale are skewed to the left, this end of the distribution being representative of the high end of the humanitarian religious type.

Table 1a. Nominations according to denomination

	Catholic	Lutheran	E-Free	Unitarian	Christian Fellowship
Intrinsic	17	3	25	0	27
Extrinsic	0	0	21	0	0
Value Conflict	0	13	19	0	4
Humanitarian	14	4	3	20	0

The PTL Extrinsic subscale is keyed for low scorers. Scores on this subscale are skewed to the left. This end of the distribution is representative of the low end of the extrinsic religious orientation. The PTL Intrinsic subscale is keyed for high scorers. Scores on this subscale are skewed to the left. This end of the distribution is representative of the high end of the intrinsic religious

orientation. Means, standard deviations and ranges were calculated for scores on each subscale. See Table 1b.

Scores were also calculated on each of the 7 subscales for the nominees of each respective religious orientation. See Table 1c for descriptive statistics on the authoritarianism, social desirability, PTL Intrinsic, PTL Extrinsic, Value Conflict and ROS subscales.

Table 1b. Descriptive statistics for overall scale scores

Scale	Total Distribution Shape	N	\bar{X}	SD	Actual Score Range	Possible Score Range
Au	normal	159	44.87	7.68	23-64	14-70
MC-20	normal	161	58.30	10.14	40-83	20-100
VC	normal	164	25.38	5.14	11-39	8-40
Hu	left skew	170	25.76	3.02	11-30	6-30
PTL X	left skew	166	19.64	3.56	11-25	5-25
PTL I	left skew	166	46.19	8.99	15-55	11-55
ROS	left skew	154	82.42	11.50	49-100	20-100

Note: The scales are represented as follows: Au = authoritarianism, MC-20 = social desirability, VC = PTL Value Conflict, Hu = PTL Humanitarianism, PTL X = PTL Extrinsic, PTL I = PTL Intrinsic, ROS = Religious Orientation Scale.

Table 1c. Descriptive statistics for scale scores of nominees

Subscale	Nomination	N	\bar{X}	SD	Actual Score Range
Authoritarianism	Hu	36	51.53	6.09	38-64
	I	69	42.68	7.23	28-64
	VC	35	43.51	7.26	23-60
	X	19	42.74	5.74	33-55
MC-20	Hu	38	61.97	8.64	40-77
	I	67	56.63	10.51	40-81
	VC	36	58.83	10.92	41-83
	X	20	56.00	8.64	40-71
Value Conflict	Hu	40	24.25	4.33	11-32
	I	69	26.17	6.02	14-39
	VC	36	24.14	4.51	15-33
	X	19	27.21	3.28	21-33
Humanitarianism	Hu	41	25.00	3.04	18-30
	I	72	25.89	3.08	11-30
	VC	36	25.94	3.11	14-30
	X	21	26.48	2.44	22-30
Extrinsic	Hu	40	18.75	3.18	11-24
	I	70	20.09	3.56	12-25
	VC	36	18.75	4.02	11-25
	X	20	21.45	2.50	17-25
Intrinsic	Hu	38	36.55	10.86	15-53
	I	71	50.13	5.43	30-55
	VC	36	45.92	6.97	25-55
	X	21	50.81	2.64	46-55
ROS	Hu	33	73.09	9.99	49-94
	I	66	87.42	9.50	60-100
	VC	35	78.31	10.96	49-99
	X	20	88.45	8.17	73-100

Note: Hu = humanitarianism, I = intrinsic, VC = value conflict, X = extrinsic.

The reliabilities of the subscales (using Coefficient Alpha) :

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Alpha</u>	<u>No. of items</u>
Intrinsic	.90	11
Extrinsic	.61	5
Value Conflict	.67	8
Humanitarianism	.48	6
MC-20	.78	20
Authoritarianism	.68	14
ROS	.86	20

The reliability of the PTL Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales taken together as a single scale is 0.83 (16 items). If the PTL Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales, as one single scale, were increased to 20 items, the reliability would be 0.86 (as measured by the Spearman-Brown formula; Brown, 1976).

A t-test was run comparing the means of subjects nominated as intrinsic and subjects nominated as in value conflict, extrinsic or as humanitarian (again, the latter three were grouped together and comprised one group in the t-test). This test was done to determine whether subjects nominated as intrinsic were different overall from subjects nominated in other categories; the rationale here was that intrinsics should stand out as a group of high scorers on

the PTL Intrinsic subscale (see Table 1d). It is seen that subjects nominated as intrinsic are scoring significantly higher on the PTL Intrinsic subscale (meaning they are more intrinsic as defined by the subscale) than those nominated as in value conflict or extrinsic or as humanitarian taken together as a group.

Table 1d. T-test on PTL intrinsic subscale comparing value conflict, extrinsic and humanitarian vs. intrinsic nominees

Group ^a	N	\bar{X}	SD	t ^b	df	P
1) VC, X & Hu nominees	95	43.25	9.98	-5.68	151.29	p<.0001
2) I nominees	71	50.13	5.43			

^aVC = value conflict, X = extrinsic, I = intrinsic, Hu = humanitarian.

^bThe value of t is based on the separate variance estimate; one-tailed probability.

A one-way ANOVA was run, ROS scores by nomination, and significant differences are found to exist between the groups. Extrinsic nominees score as significantly more intrinsic than humanitarian and value conflict nominees on the ROS. Intrinsic nominees also score as significantly more intrinsic than humanitarian and value conflict

nominees. Value conflict nominees score as significantly more intrinsic than humanitarian nominees. No significant differences exist between humanitarian and other nominated groups on the ROS. No significant difference exists between intrinsic and extrinsic nominees on the ROS. See Table 2a.

Table 2a. One-way ANOVA, ROS scores by nomination

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						H V I X
H	33	73.09	9.99	153	20.28 ⁺⁺	H
I	66	87.42	9.50			V *
V	35	78.31	10.96			I * *
X	20	88.45	8.17			X * *

Note: The ROS is keyed high for intrinsic, and low for extrinsic scores.

^aH = humanitarianism, I = intrinsic, V = value conflict, X = extrinsic.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

A one-way ANOVA was also run, PTL Intrinsic subscale scores by clergy nomination. The results were uninterpretable-- while F was significant, the tests for

homogeneity of variances indicated significantly different variances among groups. Therefore a Kruskal-Wallis rank ANOVA was done. The K-W indicates that there is a significant difference in scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale between the four nominated groups (intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian, $H = 52.67$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$). The Wilcoxon rank sum tests (Mann-Whitney U tests) were conducted between the various nominated groups to see where the difference(s) lay (see Table 2b). These showed that there is no significant difference between scores of subjects nominated as intrinsic vs. scores of subjects nominated as extrinsic on the PTL Intrinsic subscale; scores of subjects nominated as intrinsic are significantly higher than those of subjects nominated as in value conflict on the PTL Intrinsic subscale; subjects nominated as intrinsic scored significantly higher on the PTL Intrinsic subscale than those nominated as humanitarian; subjects nominated as extrinsic scored significantly higher than subjects nominated as in value conflict on the PTL Intrinsic subscale; subjects nominated as extrinsic scored significantly higher than subjects nominated as humanitarian on the PTL Intrinsic subscale; and subjects nominated as in value conflict scored significantly higher than subjects nominated as humanitarian on the PTL Intrinsic subscale.

Table 2b. Results of Wilcoxon rank sum tests for rank ANOVA
PTL Intrinsic scores by nomination

Nomination ^a	Z	p ^b
I vs. X	0.62	p > .05
I vs. VC	3.37	p < .01
I vs. Hu	6.54	p < .01
X vs. VC	2.56	p < .01
X vs. Hu	5.19	p < .01
VC vs. Hu	3.70	p < .01

Note: See Table 1c for means of nominated groups on PTL Intrinsic subscale. Probability levels based on one-tailed tests.

^aVC = value conflict, X = extrinsic, I = intrinsic, Hu = humanitarian.

^bProbability levels based on one-tailed tests.

A one-way ANOVA, PTL Extrinsic subscale scores by nomination, indicates that those nominated as extrinsic score as significantly less extrinsic on the PTL Extrinsic subscale than those nominated as humanitarian or in value conflict (or vice versa, humanitarian and value conflict nominees scored as more extrinsic on this subscale than subjects nominated as extrinsic). No significant

differences were found on the Extrinsic subscale between those nominated as intrinsic and those nominated in other groups, i.e., intrinsic vs. extrinsic, humanitarian or in value conflict (see Table 3).

Table 3. One-way ANOVA, PTL Extrinsic scores by nomination

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						H V I X
H	40	18.75	3.18	165	3.85**	H
I	70	20.09	3.56			V
V	36	18.75	4.02			I
X	20	21.45	2.50			X * *

Note: The PTL Extrinsic subscale is keyed low.

^aH = humanitarianism, I = intrinsic, V = value conflict, X = extrinsic.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

A one-way ANOVA, scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale by nomination was run. However, heteroscedascity among variances is found to exist. Therefore a Kruskal Wallace rank ANOVA was done. The K-W revealed significant

differences among the nominated groups on the PTL Value Conflict subscale ($H = 14.59$, $df = 3$, $p < .01$).

Pairwise K-Ws (Wilcoxon rank sum tests/Mann-Whitney U tests) were conducted between the various nominations to see where the differences lay. Subjects scoring as humanitarian are seen to be scoring lower on the Value Conflict subscale than subjects nominated as extrinsic (i.e., humanitarian nominees are scoring as more in value conflict as defined by this subscale since the subscale is keyed low). Subjects nominated as in value conflict are scoring lower on the Value Conflict subscale than subjects nominated as extrinsic (i.e., value conflict nominees are scoring as more in value conflict as defined by this subscale since the subscale is keyed low). No significant differences in scores are found between the value conflict nominees and those nominated as humanitarian. No significant difference exists on the Value Conflict subscale between scores of those nominated as intrinsic and those nominated as extrinsic. A significant difference is found between scores of those nominated as intrinsic and those nominated as humanitarian. The humanitarian nominees are scoring lower on the Value Conflict subscale and, hence, as more in value conflict as defined by this subscale (since the subscale is keyed low). A significant difference is found between scores of those nominated as intrinsic and those nominated as in value

conflict. The value conflict nominees are scoring lower on the subscale and, hence, as more in value conflict as defined by this subscale (since the subscale is keyed for low scorers). Significant differences are also found between those nominated as extrinsic and as in value conflict. The value conflict nominees are scoring as more in value conflict than the extrinsic nominees on the Value Conflict subscale. See Table 4.

Table 4. Results of Wilcoxon rank sum tests for rank ANOVA
PTL Value Conflict scores by nomination

Nomination ^a	Z	p ^b
I vs. X	0.65	p > .05
I vs. VC	1.75	p < .05
I vs. Hu	1.66	p < .05
X vs. VC	2.54	p < .01
X vs. Hu	2.45	p < .01
VC vs. Hu	0.27	p > .05

Note: See Table 1c for means of nominated groups on PTL Intrinsic subscale. Probability levels based on one-tailed tests.

^aVC = value conflict, X = extrinsic, I = intrinsic, Hu = humanitarian.

^bProbability levels based on one-tailed tests.

A one-way ANOVA, Humanitarianism subscale scores by nomination was also run. No significant differences exist between the scores of the various nominations (intrinsic, extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian groups) on this subscale. The humanitarian group consisted of both humanitarian nominees (nominated by clergy) and those Unitarians assumed by this author to be representative of this group (see Table 5).

Table 5. One-way ANOVA, Humanitarianism scores by nomination

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						H V I X
H	41	25.00	3.04	169	1.36	H
I	72	25.89	3.08			V
V	36	25.94	3.11			I
X	21	26.48	2.44			X

Note: The Humanitarianism subscale is keyed high.

^aH = humanitarianism, I = intrinsic, V = value conflict, X = extrinsic.

^bM = mean.

^cNo pair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

A comparison between clergy nominated humanitarians and those Unitarians assumed by this author to be representative of humanitarians on the variables of belief in God and frequency of prayer is instructive. It is found that 25% of the Unitarian sample believe in God, a little over half of these subjects do pray, and only 39% never pray; approximately 37% are agnostic and approximately 32% are atheistic. However, the responses of the subjects nominated as humanitarian by clergy parallel these findings. All of the latter group believe in God, and all of them do pray (approximately 81% pray once a day or more, 14% pray once a week or more, and 5% pray only in a critical situation or in church).

A count of the humanitarian nominees (N=41) endorsing frequency of Bible study attendance shows that 4 subjects endorsed attending Bible studies frequently, 6 are occasional attenders, 7 checked rarely attending and 24 endorsed never attending. It is seen, therefore, that 24% of the total group of humanitarian nominees attend Bible studies on a frequent to occasional basis, with 9.75% endorsing frequent attendance only.

Separating the humanitarian nominees into those nominated by clergy and those assumed by this author to be representative of humanitarians (Unitarians), a difference with regard to Bible study attendance is seen. Within the

Unitarian group (n=20) there exist no endorsements of frequent Bible study attendance. Only two respondents checked rarely attending Bible studies. All others endorse never attending.

Within the clergy nominated group of humanitarians (n=21), 4 subjects endorse frequent and 6 endorse occasional Bible study attendance. Proportionally, this amounts to 10/21, or roughly 50%, of clergy nominees attending Bible studies on a frequent to occasional basis. Roughly 20% of this group endorses attending Bible studies frequently.

A t-test was run comparing means of two subgroups of humanitarian nominees on the PTL Intrinsic subscale. The total group of humanitarian nominees (N=41) was broken down into two subgroups: 1) those who attend Bible studies frequently and occasionally and, 2) those who rarely or never attend Bible studies. Those who attend Bible studies frequently and occasionally have significantly higher PTL Intrinsic subscale scores than those who attend rarely or never. See Table 6. Since the sample sizes are small and the variances are unequal, the t^* statistic, using Satterthwaite's procedure for df (Winer, 1971), was also calculated. Results were the same ($t^* = 4.50$, $t_{.05} = 1.72$, $df (f) = 22$, $p < .005$, one-tail).

A comparison of mean scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale between Unitarians and clergy nominated

humanitarians reveals that this latter group of nominees from more traditional religions scores significantly higher in intrinsicness than those of a more religiously liberal church (Unitarians). See Table 7. Again, due to small sample sizes and unequal variances, the t^* statistic, using Satterthwaite's procedure for df (Winer, 1971), was also calculated. Results were the same ($t^* = 2.45$, $t_{.05} = -5.96$, $df (f) = 36$, $p < .001$, two-tail).

A one-way ANOVA, scales by religion, was run. It is specifically noted that denominational differences are not under study in this investigation. However, insofar as denominational differences may shed additional light on the functioning of the PTL subscales they are reported here.

No significant differences between the religious groups were found on the Humanitarianism subscale (see Table 8). This indicates that the Humanitarianism subscale is measuring consistently across religious groups. While religious persons would be expected to share the humanistic beliefs contained on this subscale, antireligious persons may not. However, a tally of the scores of Unitarian subjects endorsing atheism (item 89) reveals that this interpretation is not necessarily true. These subjects ($n=6$) also received high scores on this subtest. Actual scores were: 26, 27, 29, 21, 24, 26. Subjects who endorsed agnosticism ($n=7$) also received scores in the high

Table 6. T-test on PTL Intrinsic subscale comparing two subgroups of humanitarian nominees according to Bible study attendance

Group	N	\bar{X}	SD	t ^a	df	P
1) frequent and occasional attenders	9	46.22	6.22			
				3.41	36	p < .005
2) rarely and never attenders	29	33.55	10.28			

^aThe value of t is based on the pooled variance estimate; one tailed probability.

Table 7. T-test on PTL Intrinsic subscale comparing scores of Unitarians and clergy nominated humanitarians

Group	N	\bar{X}	SD	t ^a	df	P
1) Unitarians	19	28.90	8.59			
				-5.96	36	p < .001
2) clergy nominated humanitarians	19	44.21	6.70			

^aThe value of t is based on the pooled variance estimate; two tailed probability.

Table 8. One-way ANOVA, Humanitarianism scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
Lutheran	20	26.85	2.06	168	1.46	NS
Catholic	31	25.58	3.69			
E-Free	67	26.04	2.98			
Unitarian	20	24.90	3.19			
AFC	31	25.26	2.65			

Note: The Humanitarianism subscale is keyed high.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cNo pair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

range (23, 28, 20, 25, 24). Possible score range is from 4-30, low scores reflecting subjects who are not assumed to be humanitarian and high scores reflective of subjects assumed to be humanitarian.

Significant mean differences between religious groups on the authoritarianism subscale exist. The Ames Christian Fellowship group scores as more authoritarian than all other denominational groups. The First Evangelical Free Church group scores as more authoritarian than the Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Unitarian denominational groups. The Roman Catholic group scores as more authoritarian than the Unitarian group only. The Unitarian group scores as least authoritarian in general; however, no significant difference exists between mean authoritarianism scores of Unitarians and Lutherans. See Table 9.

No significant differences in mean MC-20 scores exist between the denominational groups. See Table 10.

Significant differences in mean Value Conflict scores between the denominational groups exist (see Table 11). The Roman Catholic group scores as significantly more in value conflict than the Unitarian, First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship groups. The Lutheran group scores as more in value conflict than the First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship groups. No significant difference in Value

Table 9. One-way ANOVA, authoritarianism scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						A B C D E
A. Lutheran	20	48.90	7.25	157	16.87 ⁺⁺	A
B. Catholic	29	47.72	7.40			B
C. E-Free	63	42.95	6.83			C * *
D. Unitarian	17	52.71	5.92			D * *
E. AFC	29	38.97	4.10			E * * * *

Note: The authoritarianism subscale is keyed low.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

Conflict scores exists between the Christian Fellowship and First Evangelical groups.

Significant mean differences in PTL Extrinsic subscale scores exist between the denominational groups (see Table 12). Roman Catholics are scoring as significantly more extrinsic on the PTL than First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship groups. Unitarians are scoring as significantly more extrinsic than the First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship groups also. However, no mean difference exists between Unitarian and Roman Catholic or Lutheran groups on the PTL Extrinsic subscale. Lutherans are scoring as more extrinsic than First Evangelicals only on this subscale.

Significant mean differences in PTL Intrinsic subscale scores also exist among denominational groups (see Table 13). Unitarians score as the least intrinsic denomination on the PTL. The First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship denominations score as the most intrinsic denomination on this subscale. No mean difference exists between scores of these latter two denominations on the PTL Intrinsic subscale.

Significant mean differences in ROS scores are found between denominations also. Unitarians are scoring as more extrinsic (and conversely, as least intrinsic) than all other denominations on the ROS. Roman Catholics are scoring as significantly more extrinsic (or, conversely, as less

Table 10. One-way ANOVA, MC-20 scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						A B C D E
A. Lutheran	20	61.15	9.02	159	2.11 ^d	A
B. Catholic	30	61.53	7.22			C
C. E-Free	65	56.03	10.67			B NS
D. Unitarian	18	59.28	9.54			A
E. AFC	27	57.37	11.95			D

Note: The MC-20 is keyed low.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cNo pair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

^dp = .08.

Table 11. One-way ANOVA, PTL Value Conflict scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						A B C D E
A. Lutheran	20	23.55	4.31	162	8.95 ⁺⁺	A
B. Catholic	31	21.39	4.80			B
C. E-Free	64	26.64	4.75			C * *
D. Unitarian	19	26.42	3.63			D *
E. AFC	29	27.34	5.37			E * *

Note: The PTL Value Conflict subscale is keyed low.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

Table 12. One-way ANOVA, PTL Extrinsic scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						A B C D E
A. Lutheran	20	19.00	3.08	164	9.13 ⁺⁺	A
B. Catholic	31	17.00	3.30			B
C. E-Free	65	20.77	3.30			C * *
D. Unitarian	19	18.47	3.12			D *
E. AFC	30	21.00	3.34			E * *

Note: The PTL Extrinsic subscale is keyed low.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKS) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

Table 13. One-way ANOVA, PTL Intrinsic scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						A B C D E
A. Lutheran	20	43.15	6.70	164	61.28 ⁺⁺	A
B. Catholic	29	44.24	6.38			B
C. E-Free	67	50.30	4.99			C * *
D. Unitarian	19	28.89	8.60			D * * *
E. AFC	30	51.87	3.23			E * * *

Note: The PTL Intrinsic subscale is keyed high.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKS) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

intrinsic) than First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship groups. Lutherans are also scoring as more extrinsic (or, conversely, as less intrinsic) than the First Evangelical and Christian Fellowship groups. The First Evangelical group is scoring as more extrinsic (or, conversely, as less intrinsic) than the Christian Fellowship group. The ROS, then, identifies the Ames Christian Fellowship group as the most intrinsic denomination. See Table 14.

An ANOVA, MC-20 scores by nomination was run. Intrinsic and extrinsic nominees scored significantly higher on the MC-20 than humanitarian nominees. This indicates that intrinsic and extrinsic nominees, on average, are presenting as more socially desirable than humanitarian nominees. No other nominated groups differed significantly on this subscale. See Table 15.

A significant correlation exists between scores of intrinsic nominees on the PTL Intrinsic subscale and MC-20 scores. Due to the direction of scoring, the interpretation of this negative correlation indicates that those scoring as intrinsic on the PTL are scoring as presenting as socially desirable on the MC-20 (see Table 16).

Table 14. One-way ANOVA, ROS scores by religion

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						A B C D E
A. Lutheran	18	77.94	10.19	152	21.58 ⁺⁺	A
B. Catholic	29	75.93	10.07			B
C. E-Free	63	86.38	9.86			C * *
D. Unitarian	15	68.33	7.58			D * * *
E. AFC	28	90.68	7.07			E * * * *

Note: The ROS is keyed low for extrinsics and high for intrinsics.

^aE-Free = First Evangelical Free Church, AFC = Ames Christian Fellowship.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

Table 15. One-way ANOVA, MC-20 scores by nomination

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						H V I X
H	38	61.97	8.64	160	2.73*	H
I	67	56.63	10.51			I *
V	36	56.83	10.92			V
X	20	56.00	8.64			X *

Note: The MC-20 is keyed low.

^aH = humanitarianism, I = intrinsic, V = value conflict, X = extrinsic.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

* $p < .05$.

Table 16. Correlations between MC-20 scores and scores of nominees on their respective subscales

	n	SD	\bar{x}	r	P
Intrinsic nominees' scores on PTL I	66	10.51	56.63	-.24	.026
Value conflict nominees' scores on VC	36	10.92	58.83	-.28	.049
Extrinsic nominees' scores on PTL X	20	8.64	56.00	.37	.055
All humanitarian nominees' scores on Hu	38	8.64	61.97	-.25	.064
Unitarians' scores on Hu	18	9.54	59.28	-.47	.023
Clergy nominated humanitarian's scores on Hu	20	7.12	64.40	-.03	.452

Note: Standard deviations and means shown are on the MC-20; P = p level.

A significant correlation exists between the MC-20 and Value Conflict subscale scores of subjects nominated as in Value Conflict. Here, subjects scoring as in value conflict are not presenting as socially desirable, while those low in value conflict are associated with presenting as socially desirable. Hence, it can be seen that subjects in value conflict are presenting as less socially desirable than intrinsic nominees (see Table 16).

A just barely significant correlation was found between the MC-20 and Extrinsic subscale scores of subjects nominated as representative of extrinsics. Here, subjects scoring as extrinsic are associated with presenting as socially desirable. This correlation is higher than that found for intrinsics and social desirability (see Table 16).

Subjects from the religiously liberal church, Unitarians, who score as highly humanitarian on the Humanitarianism subscale are associated with presenting as socially desirable on the MC-20 (see Table 16). The correlation between MC-20 scores and scores of subjects nominated as humanitarian by clergy of more traditional churches (Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Evangelical) is not significant. However, a t-test comparing mean MC-20 scores of Unitarians and clergy nominated humanitarians indicates that no significant difference exists (see Table 17). When the humanitarian nominees are taken as a group (i.e., both

those nominated by clergy of traditional churches as humanitarian and those assumed to be humanitarian, i.e., Unitarians) and their Humanitarianism subscale scores are correlated with MC-20 scores, a marginally significant correlation is found to exist (see Table 16).

Table 17. T-test on MC-20 comparing Unitarians and clergy nominated humanitarians

Group		N	X	SD	t ^a	df	P
1)	Unitarians	18	59.28	9.53	-1.84	36	NS
2)	Clergy nominated humanitarians	20	64.40	7.12			

^aThe value of t is based on the pooled variance estimate; two-tailed probability. P=p level.

Correlations were also run between MC-20 scores and all scores on the respective subscales. It was found that subjects' scores on the Intrinsic subscale, regardless of nomination, were significantly correlated with MC-20 scores (see Table 18). Those scoring high on the PTL Intrinsic subscale are associated with presenting as socially desirable. Due to the direction of scoring, this negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the PTL

Table 18. Intercorrelation of the seven subscales

	Au	MC-20	VC	Hu	PTL X	PTL I	ROS
Au	1.00	.32 ⁺	-.21**	.08 ^a	-.07	-.46 ⁺ a	-.31 ⁺ a
MC-20		1.00	-.43 ⁺	-.18**a	-.08	-.15* ^a	-.13* ^{a,b}
VC			1.00	-.04 ^a	.40 ⁺	.14* ^a	.37 ⁺ a
Hu				1.00	.04 ^a	.25 ⁺	.27 ⁺
PTL X					1.00	.30 ⁺ a	.66 ⁺ a
PTL I						1.00	.82 ⁺
ROS							1.00

^aDue to the direction of scoring, these correlations need interpretation. Please refer to text for appropriate interpretation of these correlations.

^bThis correlation is barely significant, $p=.052$.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

⁺ $p < .001$.

Intrinsic subscale are associated with low scores on the MC-20, which indicate a socially desirable presentation.

A partial correlation between PTL Intrinsic and MC-20 scores, removing the influence of the Humanitarianism scores (that are significantly correlated with MC-20 scores), shows that PTL Intrinsic scores are not significantly correlated with MC-20 scores (see Table 19). ROS scores are also barely significant in correlation with MC-20 scores. Due to

the direction of scoring, this negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the intrinsic direction) are associated with low scores on the MC-20, which indicate presenting as socially desirable; whereas low scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the extrinsic direction) are associated with high scores on the MC-20, which indicate presenting as low in social desirability. When removing the influence of the Humanitarianism scores from this correlation, it is seen that the ROS is also not significant in correlation with MC-20 scores (see Table 19).

However, a partial correlation between ROS and MC-20 scores, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores (that are significantly correlated with ROS scores), is not significant (see Table 19). This indicates that the correlation between MC-20 and ROS scores is inflated somewhat by the PTL Intrinsic scores that are significantly associated with ROS (and MC-20) scores.

A consistent relationship with social desirability is also found in the case of correlating the Value Conflict subscale scores (of all subjects) with MC-20 scores (see Table 18). Those scoring high in value conflict are not presenting as socially desirable. This finding parallels that mentioned above utilizing subjects nominated as in value conflict.

Table 19. Partial correlations involving subscale scores

	$r_{12.3}$	p^a
VC & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	-.08	NS
MC-20 & PTL I scores, removing Hu scores	-.11	NS
ROS & Au scores, removing PTL I scores	.13	NS
ROS & MC-20 scores, removing PTL I scores	-.01	NS
ROS & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.08	NS
Hu & Au scores, removing PTL I scores	.23	$p < .01$
VC & Au scores, removing PTL I scores	-.17	$p < .05$
Hu & MC-20 scores, removing PTL I scores	-.15	NS
ROS & MC-20 scores, removing Hu scores	-.09	NS

Note: PTL I = PTL Intrinsic, PTL X = PTL Extrinsic, VC = Value Conflict, Hu = Humanitarianism, Au = authoritarianism subscale.

^aAll p levels are two-tailed.

No significant correlation is found between MC-20 scores and scores of subjects on the PTL Extrinsic subscale (regardless of nomination) (see Table 18). This indicates that no association exists between presenting as socially desirable and scoring as extrinsic on the PTL. It also indicates that the barely significant correlation between PTL Extrinsic scores of subjects nominated as extrinsic and MC-20 scores may be due to chance fluctuation (or the unreliability of the extrinsic nominations).

A significant correlation is found between MC-20 scores and scores of subjects (regardless of nomination) on the Humanitarianism subscale (see Table 18). Due to the direction of scoring, this negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the PTL Humanitarianism subscale are associated with low scores on the MC-20, which indicate presenting as socially desirable. This finding is consistent with regard to the significant correlation between MC-20 scores and scores of subjects from a religiously liberal church (Unitarians). It is also consistent with regard to the marginally significant correlation between overall humanitarian nominees (i.e., those nominated by clergy and those Unitarians assumed by this author to be representative of humanitarianism taken as a group). However, this finding is inconsistent with the finding mentioned above with regard to subjects nominated as

humanitarian by clergy (i.e., excluding the Unitarian sample) (no significant correlation was found).

The difference in findings may be due to the inclusion of subjects who score high on the Intrinsic subscale in the group of all Humanitarian scorers. Those high in intrinsicness were found to be associated with presenting as socially desirable. Their scores were also found to be correlated with high scores on the Humanitarianism subscale (see Table 18). When partialling out the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores from the correlation between overall Humanitarianism and MC-20 scores, the correlation is attenuated to a level of nonsignificance (see Table 19). It is also noted that no significant mean difference exists between MC-20 scores of Unitarians and clergy nominated humanitarians even though the consistency of association with MC-20 scores differs for the Humanitarianism scores of these subgroups (see Table 17).

Only one mean difference in MC-20 scores between nominated groups exists. It is seen that intrinsic nominees score as presenting with more social desirability than the group of humanitarian nominees (which consists of both clergy nominated humanitarians and those Unitarians assumed by this author to be representative of humanitarians) (see Table 15).

Pearson product-moment correlations were run between scores on the authoritarianism measure and scores of subjects nominated as extrinsic, intrinsic and in value conflict; scores on the authoritarianism measure were also correlated with scores of subjects from the Unitarian church and scores of subjects nominated by clergy as humanitarian, as well as scores of all subjects from the latter two groups who were categorized as humanitarian (see Table 20).

It was found that scores of subjects who were nominated as extrinsic on the PTL Extrinsic subscale are not correlated with scores on the authoritarianism subscale. A highly significant correlation was found to exist between scores of subjects nominated as intrinsic on the PTL Intrinsic subscale with scores on the authoritarianism subscale. This negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale (which indicate high states of intrinsicness) are associated with low scores on the authoritarianism subscale (which indicate high states of authoritarianism).

No significant correlation was found between authoritarianism scores and scores of subjects nominated as in value conflict on the Value Conflict subscale. No significant correlation was found between authoritarianism scores and Humanitarianism scores of subjects from a religiously liberal church (Unitarians). Likewise, no

Table 20. Correlations between authoritarianism and MC-20 scores with scores of nominees on their respective subscales

	Authoritarianism	MC-20
Extrinsic nominee scores on PTL X	.22	.37 ^a
Intrinsic nominee scores on PTL I	-.31 ⁺	-.24*
Value conflict nominee scores on VC	-.12	-.28*
Unitarians' scores on Hu	.13	-.47*
Clergy nominated humanitarians scores on Hu	.27	-.03
All humanitarian nominee scores on Hu	.17	-.26

Note: PTL I = PTL Intrinsic, PTL X = PTL Extrinsic, VC = Value Conflict, Hu = Humanitarianism subscale. The group of all humanitarian nominees includes both Unitarians and clergy nominated humanitarians.

^aThis correlation is barely significant, $p = .055$.

* $p < .05$.

⁺ $p < .005$.

significant correlation was found between authoritarianism scores and scores of subjects nominated by clergy as humanitarian on the Humanitarianism subscale. It is not surprising that no significant correlation was found between authoritarianism scores and scores of subjects categorized as humanitarian on the Humanitarianism subscale. This latter test grouped together Unitarian subjects and subjects from other denominations who were nominated as humanitarian by the clergy.

A one-way ANOVA, authoritarianism scale scores by nomination, found that significant differences exist between the various religious orientations in authoritarianism (see Table 21).

The Student-Newman-Keuls procedure showed that humanitarian nominees (here both Unitarians, assumed representative of humanitarians, and subjects nominated by clergy as humanitarian are grouped together) had a significantly less authoritarian attitude than intrinsic, extrinsic and value conflict nominees. No other nominated groups scored as significantly different on this subscale.

Correlations between overall scores, regardless of nomination, on the PTL with authoritarianism scores were also run (see Table 18). PTL Extrinsic subscale scores are not significant in correlation with authoritarianism scores. PTL Intrinsic scores are significantly correlated with

Table 21. One-way ANOVA, authoritarianism scores by nomination

Group ^a	n	M ^b	SD	df	F	SNK ^c
						H V I X
H	36	51.53	6.09	158	14.82 ⁺⁺	H
I	69	42.68	7.23			V *
V	35	43.51	7.26			I *
X	19	42.74	5.74			X *

Note: The authoritarianism scale is keyed low.

^aH = humanitarianism, I = intrinsic, V = value conflict, X = extrinsic.

^bM = mean.

^cPair-wise comparisons (SNKs) are significant at $p < .05$.

⁺⁺ $p < .0001$.

authoritarianism scores. Due to the direction of scoring, this negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale (which indicate high states of intrinsicness) are associated with low scores on the Authoritarianism subscale (which indicate high states of authoritarianism). Therefore, high intrinsic scores are associated with scores indicative of authoritarian characteristics, while low intrinsic scores are associated with scores indicative of low authoritarianism.

Value Conflict scores are significantly correlated with authoritarianism scores in the direction of scores representative of high states of value conflict being consistent in association with scores indicative of low authoritarian characteristics, and scores representative of low states of value conflict being associated with scores representing high authoritarian characteristics. A partial correlation, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores, does not attenuate this correlation to a level of nonsignificance (see Table 22). The inconsistency found in the correlations between authoritarianism scores and scores of subjects (i.e., all subjects regardless of nomination and those nominated as in value conflict) on the Value Conflict subscale, however, is not serious. Both correlations are in the same direction, and the difference in significance may

be due to the greater power of a larger sample ($r = -.12$, $n=35$; $r = -.21$, $n=157$).

Overall Humanitarianism scores are not significantly correlated with authoritarianism scores. Due to the direction of scoring, however, the nonsignificant, but positive, correlation that is found would be interpreted as high scores on the Humanitarianism subscale (indicative of humanitarian types) are associated with high scores on the authoritarianism scale (indicative of low states of authoritarianism). A partial correlation, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores, indicates that the correlation is, however, significant. That is, with the effects of the intrinsic scores removed, the relationship between humanitarianism and authoritarianism is strong. The partial correlation indicates that those scoring high in humanitarian characteristics are not associated with authoritarian characteristics, and those low in humanitarianism are associated with authoritarian characteristics.

MC-20 scores are significantly associated with authoritarianism scores in the direction of scores representative of a socially desirable presentation associating with scores representative of high authoritarian characteristics (see Table 22).

ROS scores are significantly correlated with authoritarianism scores. This negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the consistently intrinsic direction) are associated with low scores on the Authoritarianism subscale (which indicate high states of authoritarianism), while low scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the consistently extrinsic direction) are associated with high scores on the Authoritarianism measure (which indicate low states of authoritarianism). Therefore, scores representative of consistently intrinsic types are associated with high authoritarianism scores, and scores representative of consistently extrinsic types are associated with low authoritarianism scores. When removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores from the correlation between ROS and authoritarianism scores, the significance of the correlation is attenuated to a level of nonsignificance (see Table 22).

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run between the PTL Intrinsic subscale and the ROS. A highly significant correlation was found (see Table 18). It should be noted, however, that 3 of the 11 items on the Intrinsic Religiosity subscale are from the Religious Orientation Scale. (Note: high scores on the ROS indicate consistent intrinsic religiosity, while low ROS scores indicate a

Table 22. Partial correlations involving demographic variables

	$r_{12.3}$	p^a
Bible study & PTL I, removing Hu scores	-.72	----
Preference for joining a Bible Study/social fellowship & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.11	NS
Prayer frequency & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.05	NS
Frequency of attendance & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	-.09	NS
Place of prayer & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.03	NS
Frequency of church social attendance & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.03	NS
Bible study & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.09	NS
ROS & frequency of church social attendance, removing PTL I scores	-.13	NS
Prayer meeting attendance & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.06	NS
Belief in God & Hu scores, removing PTL I scores	.09	NS
Preference for Bible study/church social & Hu scores removing PTL I scores	.11	NS
VC & Bible study scores, removing PTL I scores	-.19	$p < .02$
VC & PTL X scores, removing age	.36	$p < .001$
Prayer meeting attendance & VC scores, removing PTL I scores	-.10	NS

Note: PTL I= PTL Intrinsic, PTL X = PTL Extrinsic, VC = Value Conflict, Hu = Humanitarianism, Au = authoritarianism subscale.

^aAll p levels are two-tailed.

consistent extrinsic religious orientation.)

A significantly high correlation was found to exist between scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale and scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale (see Table 18). This positive correlation is interpreted as high scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale (which indicate high states of intrinsicness) are associated with high scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale (which indicate low states of extrinsicness). Therefore, this indicates that subjects who are scoring high in intrinsicness are scoring low in extrinsicness and vice versa.

Correlations of the ROS and PTL Extrinsic, Value Conflict and Humanitarianism subscales were also run (see Table 18). It was found that scores on the Value Conflict subscale are significantly correlated with ROS scores. Due to the direction of scoring, this positive correlation is interpreted as high scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the intrinsic direction) are associated with high scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale (which indicate low states of value conflict), whereas low scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the extrinsic direction) are associated with low scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale (which indicate high states of value conflict). Thus, this correlation indicates that subjects scoring as intrinsic on the ROS are not scoring as high in value

conflict, while those scoring as extrinsic on the ROS are scoring high in value conflict.

The correlation between the PTL Extrinsic subscale scores and Value Conflict subscale scores is significant (see Table 18). Those scoring high in extrinsicness on the PTL score high in value conflict. It is noted that the correlation between PTL Extrinsic and Value Conflict scores remains significant even with the effects of age removed (see Table 22). The correlation between PTL Intrinsic scores and Value Conflict scores is also significant (see Table 18). Due to the direction of scoring, this positive correlation is interpreted as high scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale (which indicate high states of intrinsicness) are associated with high scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale (which indicate low states of value conflict). Thus, those scoring high in intrinsicness are scoring low in value conflict, and vice-versa, those low in intrinsicness are high in value conflict.

The correlation between scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale and the ROS is significant (see Table 18). This positive correlation is interpreted as high scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the intrinsic direction) are associated with high scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale (which indicate low states of extrinsicness), whereas low scores on the ROS (which indicate scoring in the extrinsic

direction) are associated with low scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale (indicative of high extrinsic states). It also indicates that those scoring as extrinsic on the PTL Extrinsic subscale are scoring as extrinsically religious on the ROS, and those scoring as low in extrinsicness on the PTL are scoring as intrinsic on the ROS.

The correlation between scores on the PTL Humanitarianism subscale and the ROS is significant (see Table 18). It is interpreted as those scoring as extrinsic on the ROS are scoring as low in humanitarianism on the PTL Humanitarianism subscale, and that those scoring as humanitarian on the PTL are scoring as intrinsic on the ROS.

In an analogous manner, the correlation between scores on the Intrinsic subscale of the PTL and scores on the Humanitarianism subscale is also significant (see Table 18). Subjects who are high in intrinsic religiosity are also high in humanitarianism. Those low in intrinsic religiosity are also low in humanitarianism.

However, no significant correlation is found to exist between scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale and the Humanitarianism subscale (see Table 18). A partial correlation was run on the Humanitarianism and ROS scores, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores. This partial correlation shows that when controlling for the effects of intrinsic scores, the correlation between

Humanitarianism and ROS scores is attenuated to a level of nonsignificance (see Table 22).

Scores on the Humanitarianism subscale overall are not significantly correlated with scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale (see Table 18). Due to the direction of scoring, this negative correlation is interpreted as scoring high on the Value Conflict subscale (which indicates low states of value conflict) is associated with scoring low in Humanitarianism (which is indicative of the egocentrism with hostility end of this dimension), while scoring low on the Value Conflict subscale (indicating high states of value conflict) is associated with high Humanitarianism scores (indicative of humanitarian types). A partial correlation between Value Conflict and Humanitarianism scores, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores, confirms that the correlation is nonsignificant.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between age (item 76) and respective scores on the MC-20 and the authoritarianism measure (see Table 23). Mixed results are found with regard to age and religious orientation. A significant correlation is found to exist between scores on the Value Conflict subscale and age. Scores that represent the state of experiencing higher degrees of value conflict are associated with being younger. The age range of subjects is from younger than 18 to older than 61, with the

mode of age in the 18-29 year old category (57% of subjects lie here). The younger end of the age spectrum is also significantly correlated with scoring as more extrinsic on the PTL Extrinsic subscale.

No significant correlations are found between age and the PTL Intrinsic subscale, nor age and the Humanitarianism subscale. Neither is a significant correlation found between age and scores on the ROS.

Social desirability scores on the MC-20 are found to be significantly correlated with age. Younger subjects are associated with presenting as less socially desirable than older subjects.

Authoritarianism scores are also found to be significantly correlated with age. Younger subjects are associated with scoring as less authoritarian than older subjects.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between sex and respective scores on the MC-20, authoritarianism measure and religious orientation subscales (see Table 23). Sex is not found to be significantly correlated with social desirability scores on the MC-20. Sex is significantly correlated with authoritarianism scores. Males are found to be associated with an authoritarian presentation, and females with a less authoritarian presentation. Sex is also significantly

correlated with PTL Humanitarianism subscale scores. Females are found to be associated with high Humanitarianism scores, and males with low Humanitarianism scores. Sex is not found to be significantly correlated with other religious orientation scores on the PTL (i.e., Intrinsic, Extrinsic or Value Conflict); nor is sex significantly correlated with ROS scores.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between affirmation of church membership (item 78) and the various subscales (see Table 24). It is found that no significant correlations result between affirmation of membership and any of the PTL subscales, nor with the MC-20 or authoritarianism scales. A correlation exists between affirmation of membership and the ROS at a lower level of significance ($p=.08$). Due to the direction of keying, this negative correlation is interpreted as scores representing intrinsicness on the ROS are associated with affirmation of church membership, while scores representing extrinsicness are associated with negating church membership. However, the correlations with the membership variable are questionable overall. The membership item is badly split. There is a preponderance of "yes" responses to this item (in toto, 150 yes and 13 no responses). Therefore, it can be concluded that the item did not correlate well with other variables due to range restriction.

Table 23. Intercorrelation of the subscales with sex and age

	Sex	Age	
Au	.23**a	-.14*b	
MC-20		.07	-.30+c
VC	-.11	.25+	
Hu	.31+	.02	
PTL X		-.11	.23**d
PTL I		-.08	-.03
ROS	-.05	.08	

Note: Au = authoritarianism, VC = Value Conflict, Hu = Humanitarianism, PTL X = PTL Extrinsic, PTL I = PTL Intrinsic subscale.

^aDue to the direction of scoring (sex is coded such that 1 = male and 2 = female), the correlation between sex and authoritarianism is interpreted as those presenting as high in authoritarianism are male.

^bThe correlation between age and authoritarianism is interpreted as those presenting as high in authoritarianism are older.

^cThe correlation between MC-20 scores and age is interpreted as those presenting as high in social desirability are older.

^dThe correlation between PTL Extrinsic scores and age is interpreted as those scoring as high in extrinsicness are younger.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .005$.

+ $p < .001$.

Frequency of church attendance (item 82) ranged from attending more than once per week (scored as 1) to less than once per month (scored as 4). The mean is 1.59, indicating mean attendance across all cases (n=167) is at least once per week. The distribution is skewed in the direction of frequent attendance.

A significant correlation is found between PTL Intrinsic subscale scores and frequency of worship service attendance (see Table 24). This negative correlation is interpreted as those scores representative of high intrinsicness are associated with frequent attendance, and scores representing low intrinsicness are associated with infrequent attendance.

A significant correlation is also found between PTL Extrinsic Religiosity scores and frequency of attendance (see Table 24). This correlation indicates that subjects scoring high in extrinsic religiosity are not frequently attending church, and subjects scoring low in extrinsic religiosity are attending church frequently.

A correlation between the ROS and frequency of worship service attendance is also found to be significant (see Table 24). This negative correlation is interpreted as those ROS scores representing intrinsicness are associated with frequent attendance, and ROS scores representing extrinsicness are associated with infrequent attendance.

A significant correlation is found between the PTL Humanitarianism subscale and frequency of church attendance (see Table 24). This negative correlation is interpreted as those scores representative of high humanitarianism are associated with attending more than once a week, while scores representative of low humanitarian characteristics are associated with infrequent attendance. However, a partial correlation between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of church attendance removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores shows that the relationship is attenuated to a level of nonsignificance (see Table 22).

The correlation between scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale and frequency of church attendance is not significant (see Table 24). A significant correlation between the MC-20 and frequency of attendance is found (see Table 24). This correlation indicates that subjects who are presenting as socially desirable are frequently attending church, and those who are low in social desirability are not frequently attending. No significant correlation is found between scores on the authoritarianism measure and frequency of church attendance (see Table 24).

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between Bible study attendance (item 83) and the respective subscales (see Table 24). Frequency of Bible study attendance ranged from frequently (scored as 1) to never

Table 24. Correlation of the subscales with religious variables

	Au	MC-20	VC	Hu	PTL X	PTL I	ROS
Church membership	.08	.08	.07	.05	-.04	-.08	-.11 ^a
Worship service attendance	.09	.18* ⁻	-.03	-.19** ^a	-.15*	-.43 ^{++a}	-.44 ^{++a}
Bible study attendance	.39 ⁺⁺	.06	-.23 ⁺⁺	-.12 ^a	-.37 ⁺⁺	-.73 ^{++a}	-.69 ^{++a}
Church social attendance	-.07	.02	-.11	-.12	-.08	-.18* ^a	-.25 ^{++a}
Prayer meeting attendance	.32 ⁺⁺	.06	-.16*	-.10	-.19**	-.58 ^{++a}	-.55 ^{++a}
Prayer frequency	.35 ⁺⁺	.10	-.10	-.16* ^a	-.26 ⁺⁺	-.76 ^{++a}	-.71 ^{++a}
Place of prayer	-.18* ^a	-.03	.02	.19**	.13* ^a	.63 ⁺⁺	.48 ⁺⁺
Belief in God	.29 ⁺⁺	.01	.02	-.09	-.18*	-.63 ^{++a}	-.42 ^{++a}
Joining Bible study/social fellowship	.42 ⁺⁺	.10	-.22 ⁺	-.10	-.40 ⁺⁺	-.73 ⁺⁺	-.71 ⁺⁺

Note: Au = authoritarianism, PTL I = PTL Intrinsic, PTL X = PTL Extrinsic, VC = Value Conflict, Hu = Humanitarianism subscale.

^aNote: Refer to text regarding interpretation of these correlations.

*p < .05; ⁺p < .005.

**p < .01; ⁺⁺p < .001.

(scored as 4). The mean is 2.06 (N=167), indicating an overall average of occasional Bible study attendance (scored as 2).

A significant correlation is found between frequency of Bible study attendance and scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale. This negative correlation is interpreted as those scores representing high intrinsicness are associated with frequent Bible study attendance, while scores representing low intrinsicness are associated with infrequent Bible study attendance.

A significant correlation is found between frequency of Bible study attendance and scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale. This correlation indicates that subjects scoring high in extrinsicness on the PTL tend not to attend Bible study, and subjects scoring low in extrinsicness are frequently attending.

A significant correlation is found between frequency of Bible study attendance and scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale. This correlation indicates that subjects scoring high in value conflict tend not to attend Bible studies, and those scoring low in value conflict are frequently attending. A partial correlation between frequency of Bible study attendance and Value Conflict subscale scores shows that this correlation remains significant even when the influence of PTL Intrinsic scores is removed (see Table 22).

The correlation between frequency of Bible study attendance and the Humanitarianism subscale is marginally significant ($p=.057$). Due to the direction of keying, this negative correlation is interpreted as high scores on the Humanitarianism subscale (i.e., those high in humanitarian characteristics) are associated with frequent Bible study attendance, and low Humanitarianism scores are associated with infrequent Bible study attendance.

A partial correlation was run between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of Bible study attendance removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores (which are significantly correlated with Humanitarianism scores). The marginally significant correlation between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of Bible study attendance is now attenuated to a level of nonsignificance in this partial correlation (see Table 22). Since the PTL Intrinsic and Humanitarianism subscale scores are highly correlated, a partial correlation was run between PTL Intrinsic and frequency of Bible study attendance to remove the effects of the Humanitarianism scores on this correlation. However, the correlation remains significant between PTL Intrinsic scores and frequency of Bible study attendance (see Table 22).

A significant correlation is also found between scores on the ROS and frequency of Bible study attendance. This

negative correlation is interpreted as those ROS scores representing intrinsicness are associated with frequent Bible study attendance, and ROS scores representing extrinsicness are associated with infrequent Bible study attendance.

A significant correlation between authoritarianism scores and frequency of Bible study attendance is found. This correlation indicates that subjects scoring high in authoritarianism are frequently attending Bible studies, and those scoring low in authoritarianism tend not to attend. There is no significant correlation between scores on the MC-20 and frequency of Bible study attendance.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between frequency of church social function attendance (item 84) and the respective subscales (see Table 24). Responses on the questionnaire ranged from frequently (scored as 1) to occasionally (scored as 2), to rarely (scored 3), to never (scored 4). Scores ranged from 1 to 4 with a mean of 1.67. Hence, the distribution of responses to this item is skewed to the right, with the majority of subjects (N=168) attending church social functions on a frequent (46.4% endorsing this choice) to occasional (40.6%) basis. Only 1.2% of the subjects endorsed never.

No significant correlation is found between church social function attendance and scores on the PTL Extrinsic

subscale. A significant correlation is found between scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale and church social attendance. This negative correlation is interpreted as scores representing high intrinsicness are associated with frequent church social attendance, while scores representing low intrinsicness are associated with infrequent church social attendance.

No significant correlation exists between church social attendance and scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale. No significant correlation is found between church social attendance and scores on the PTL Humanitarianism subscale. A partial correlation was also run on the relationship between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of church social attendance, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores that are significantly correlated with Humanitarianism scores. This partial correlation confirms that the relationship is not significant (see Table 22).

Correlations were also run between church social function attendance and scores on the authoritarianism measure and the MC-20 respectively. Neither of these scales are significant in correlation with this variable (see Table 22).

A significant correlation between church social attendance and the ROS is found. This negative correlation is interpreted as ROS scores representative of intrinsicness

are associated with frequent church social attendance, while ROS scores representative of extrinsicness are associated with infrequent church social attendance. However, when partialling out the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores from the correlation between frequency of church social function attendance and ROS scores, the correlation is attenuated to nonsignificance (see Table 22).

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between frequency of prayer meeting attendance (item 85) and the respective subscales (see Table 24). The range of responses is from frequently (scored as 1) to occasionally (2), rarely (3), to never (4), with a mean of 2.5, indicating rare to occasional average attendance. Subjects are about evenly distributed across the 4 response categories.

A significant correlation is found between frequency of prayer meeting attendance and PTL Intrinsic subscale scores. This negative correlation is interpreted as scores representing high intrinsicness are associated with frequent prayer meeting attendance, while scores representing low states of intrinsicness are associated with infrequent prayer meeting attendance.

A significant correlation is found between frequency of prayer meeting attendance and scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale. Those scoring high in extrinsicness are

associated with not attending prayer meetings, while those low in extrinsicness are associated with frequent prayer meeting attendance.

A significant correlation is found between frequency of prayer meeting attendance and PTL Value Conflict subscale scores. Those low in value conflict are associated with frequent prayer meeting attendance, and those high in value conflict are associated with a tendency not to attend prayer meetings. However, a partial correlation between Value Conflict subscale scores and frequency of prayer meeting attendance, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores, attenuates the correlation to a level of nonsignificance (see Table 22).

No significant correlation is found between the PTL Humanitarianism subscale and frequency of prayer meeting attendance. A partial correlation, removing the effects of the PTL Intrinsic scores from the correlation between frequency of prayer meeting attendance and Humanitarianism scores, confirms that the relationship is not significant (see Table 22). Nor is a significant correlation found between MC-20 scores and prayer meeting attendance.

A significant correlation is found between authoritarianism scores and frequency of prayer meeting attendance. Low scores on the authoritarianism measure (indicative of high authoritarian characteristics) are

associated with frequent prayer meeting attendance, while those high authoritarianism scores (indicative of low authoritarian characteristics) are associated with a tendency not to attend prayer meetings.

A significant correlation is found between ROS scores and frequency of prayer meeting attendance. This negative correlation is interpreted as ROS scores representative of intrinsicness (high scores) are associated with frequent prayer meeting attendance, while ROS scores representing extrinsicness (low scores) are associated with infrequent prayer meeting attendance.

Pearson product-moment correlations between frequency of prayer (item 87) and the respective subscales were calculated (see Table 24). Response values ranged from 1 to 5, with choices from more than once a day (scored as 1) to never (scored as 5). The resultant range of item responses is 1 to 5 with a mean of 1.7, indicating an average of praying at least once a day or more. The distribution is skewed to the right with 59% of respondents praying more than once a day. Only 4.1% endorsed never praying.

A significant correlation between frequency of prayer and the PTL Intrinsic subscale scores is found. This negative correlation is interpreted as scores representative of high intrinsicness (high PTL I scores) are associated with high frequency of prayer (which is keyed low), while

scores representative of low intrinsicness (low PTL I scores) are associated with low frequency of prayer (keyed high). Those scoring high in intrinsicness are associated with praying more than once a day, while those scoring low in intrinsicness are associated with never praying.

A significant correlation between frequency of prayer and the ROS is also found. This negative correlation is interpreted as ROS scores representing intrinsicness (high scores) are associated with high frequency of prayer (keyed low), and ROS scores representing extrinsicness (low scores) are associated with low frequency of prayer (keyed high). Those scoring as intrinsic on the ROS are associated with praying more than once a day, and those scoring as extrinsic are associated with never praying.

A significant correlation between frequency of prayer and PTL Extrinsic subscale scores is found. Those scoring low in extrinsicness are associated with praying more than once a day, while those scoring high in extrinsicness are associated with never praying. No significant correlation is found between the PTL Value Conflict subscale and frequency of prayer.

A significant correlation is found between frequency of prayer and the PTL Humanitarianism subscale. This negative correlation is interpreted as scores representing humanitarian characteristics are associated with high

frequency of prayer, while scores representing low humanitarian characteristics are associated with low frequency of prayer. Those scoring high in humanitarianism are associated with praying more than once a day, while those scoring low in humanitarianism are associated with never praying. However, a partial correlation between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of prayer, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores, shows that Humanitarianism scores and frequency of prayer are not significantly correlated (see Table 22).

Frequency of prayer is significantly correlated with scores on the authoritarianism measure. Those scoring low in authoritarianism (i.e., high authoritarian characteristics) are associated with praying more than once a day, while those scoring high in authoritarianism (i.e., low authoritarian characteristics) are associated with never praying. No significant correlation is found between frequency of prayer and scores on the MC-20.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between place of prayer (item 88) and the respective subscales (see Table 24). Response alternatives ranged from nowhere (i.e., I do not pray) (scored as 1) through any place, any time (scored as 5). Response values ranged from 1 to 5 with a mean of 4.7. The distribution is skewed to

the left with 86.7% of respondents endorsing any place, any time. Only 4.1% of respondents checked nowhere.

A significant correlation is found between place of prayer and scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale. High intrinsic scores are associated with praying any place and any time, while low intrinsic scores are associated with praying nowhere or only in church. The correlation for place of prayer and ROS scores parallels this finding for subjects scoring as intrinsic. Those scoring as intrinsic on the ROS are also endorsing any place and any time, while those scoring as extrinsic on the ROS are associated with praying nowhere or only in church.

A significant correlation is found between place of prayer and scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale. This correlation is interpreted as scores representing high extrinsicness are associated with praying nowhere or only in church, and those representing low extrinsicness are associated with prayer in any place at any time.

A significant correlation is found between place of prayer and scores on the PTL Humanitarianism subscale. This indicates that subjects scoring high in humanitarianism are associated with praying any place and any time, while subjects scoring low in humanitarianism are associated with praying nowhere or only in church. However, a partial correlation between place of prayer and Humanitarianism

scores, removing the influence of PTL Intrinsic scores, shows that this relationship is not significant (see Table 22).

No significant correlation is found between place of prayer and scores on the PTL Value Conflict subscale. A significant correlation is found between place of prayer and authoritarianism scores. This negative correlation is interpreted as those scoring high in authoritarian characteristics are associated with praying any place and any time, while subjects low in authoritarian characteristics are associated with praying nowhere or only in church. No significant correlation is found between place of prayer and MC-20 scores.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between belief in God (item 89) and the respective subscales (see Table 24). Response alternatives to item 89 ranged from definitely believe (scored as 1) through atheist (scored as 5). Actual responses (N=167) range from 1 to 5 with a mean of 1.4. The distribution is skewed to the right with 83.3% of respondents endorsing definite belief in God, 4.2% endorsing agnosticism, and 4.8% endorsing atheism.

A significant correlation is found between belief in God and scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale. This negative correlation is interpreted as scores representing high intrinsicness are associated with definite belief in God,

and those representing low intrinsicness are associated with agnostic and atheistic beliefs.

A significant correlation is found between belief in God and scores on the ROS. This negative correlation is interpreted as ROS scores representing intrinsicness are associated with definite belief in God, while ROS scores representing extrinsicness are associated with agnostic and atheistic beliefs.

A significant correlation is found between belief in God and scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale. Those scoring high in extrinsicness are associated with agnostic and atheistic beliefs, while those scoring low in extrinsicness are associated with definite belief in God.

No significant correlations are found between belief in God and the following PTL subscales: Value Conflict and Humanitarianism. A significant correlation is found between the authoritarianism measure and belief in God. Those scoring high in authoritarianism are associated with definite belief in God, while those scoring low in authoritarianism are associated with agnosticism and atheism. No significant correlation is found between the MC-20 and belief in God.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between item 90, preference for joining a Bible study or social fellowship, and the respective subscales (see Table

24). Response alternatives range from preference for joining a Bible study (scored as 1), probably preferring to join a Bible study (2), probably preferring to join a social fellowship (3), to preference for joining a social fellowship (4). This item is taken from Allport's ROS. Response values ranged from 1 to 4 with a mean of 1.9. The distribution is skewed to the right, with 54.3% of respondents endorsing (1), preference for joining a Bible study (N=164). Respondents are about evenly distributed as to the remaining response alternatives.

A significant correlation is found between item 90 and scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale. Subjects scoring high in intrinsicness are associated with preference for joining a Bible study, while those low in intrinsicness are associated with preference for joining a social fellowship.

A significant correlation is found between item 90 and scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale. Those scoring as high in extrinsicness are associated with preference for joining a social fellowship, while those scoring as low in extrinsicness are associated with preference for joining a Bible study.

A significant correlation is found between item 90 and scores on the ROS. Those scoring as intrinsic on the ROS are associated with preference for joining a Bible study, and subjects scoring as extrinsic are associated with

preference for joining a social fellowship. (Note: again, item 90 also exists as an item used in scoring the ROS.)

A significant correlation is found for item 90 and the PTL Value Conflict subscale. Those scoring high in value conflict are associated with preference for joining a social fellowship, while those scoring low in value conflict are associated with preference for joining a Bible study.

No significant correlation is found between item 90 and the Humanitarianism subscale. A partial correlation between preference for joining a social fellowship or a Bible study and Humanitarianism scores, removing the influence of PTL Intrinsic scores, confirms that the relationship is not significant (see Table 22). Nor is a significant relationship found between item 90 and the MC-20.

A significant correlation is found between item 90 and the authoritarianism measure. Those scoring high in authoritarianism are preferring to join a Bible study, while subjects scoring low in authoritarianism are preferring to join a social fellowship.

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 was partially confirmed. Subjects nominated by their respective clergy as intrinsically religious scored higher on the PTL Intrinsic subscale than those nominated as in value conflict or as humanitarian. However, contrary to hypothesized expectations, intrinsic nominees scored no differently than extrinsic nominees on this subscale.

Hypothesis 2 was unconfirmed. Subjects nominated as extrinsic scored as significantly less extrinsic on the PTL Extrinsic subscale than those nominated as humanitarian or as in value conflict.

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed. Subjects nominated as in value conflict scored as significantly more in value conflict on the PTL Value Conflict subscale than intrinsic and extrinsic nominees.

Hypothesis 4 was unconfirmed. No significant mean differences existed between nominated groups on the Humanitarianism subscale.

Hypothesis 5 was also unconfirmed. No significant differences existed between scores of the various religious groups on this subscale when categorized as to denomination.

Hypothesis 6 was only partially confirmed. Intrinsic nominee scores were significantly correlated with scores indicative of a socially desirable presentation on the MC-

20, and, in general, more so than scores of extrinsic, value conflict and humanitarian nominees nominated by clergy of traditional churches. The hypothesis was partially confirmed in that intrinsic nominees appeared to be less associated with presenting as socially desirable than the religiously liberal group of Unitarians. However, it is noted that scores of intrinsic nominees were more strongly associated with a socially desirable presentation than scores of the total group of humanitarian nominees (i.e., those nominated as humanitarian by clergy of traditional churches and those Unitarians assumed by this author to be humanitarian).

Overall, hypothesis 7 was unconfirmed. Only the expected nonsignificant relationship between Authoritarianism and Humanitarianism subscale scores of Unitarians was confirmed. Contrary to expectations, Extrinsic Religiosity subscale scores of subjects nominated as extrinsic were not significantly correlated with authoritarianism scores. Also contrary to expectations were the significant correlations between intrinsic and value conflict nominee scores on their respective PTL subscales and the authoritarianism measure. These latter two correlations indicate that nominees high in intrinsicness tend to present with authoritarian characteristics, and

nominees in high states of value conflict tend to be inconsistent with regard to authoritarian characteristics.

Hypothesis 8 was confirmed. High scores on the PTL Intrinsic subscale were significantly correlated with high scores (indicative of a consistent intrinsic religious orientation) on the ROS.

Hypothesis 9 was only partially confirmed. Contrary to expectations, age was found to be significantly correlated with scores on the PTL Extrinsic and Value Conflict subscales. The younger end of the age continuum was associated with scores representative of higher degrees of extrinsicness and value conflict respectively. In line with hypothesized expectations, age was not associated with PTL Intrinsic, Humanitarianism or ROS scores. Also contrary to expectations, age was found to be significantly correlated with MC-20 and authoritarianism scores. Younger ages were, respectively, associated with scores representative of presenting as less socially desirable and less authoritarian.

Hypothesis 10 was partially confirmed. According to expectations, sex was not correlated with social desirability scores, PTL Intrinsic, Extrinsic or Value Conflict scores, nor with ROS scores. However, contrary to hypothesized expectations, sex was seen to be significant in association with Humanitarianism and Authoritarianism

scores. Females tended to be high in humanitarian characteristics and males tended to be low in humanitarianism (or, conversely, high in egocentric and hostile characteristics). With regard to authoritarian characteristics, males tended to be high and females tended to be low.

Hypothesis 11 was unconfirmed. Affirmation of church membership was not positively correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity, nor negatively correlated with Value Conflict and Humanitarianism subscale scores. However, due to a preponderance of affirmative responses to the membership item, the item appears to be badly split and, in all likelihood, did not correlate well with other variables due to restriction in range. This situation renders invalid any conclusions regarding the membership variable.

Hypothesis 12 was confirmed. In line with expectations, frequency of church attendance was significantly correlated with Value Conflict, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity in the expected direction. Those scoring high in intrinsicness on the PTL and ROS tended to frequently attend worship services, while those scoring high in extrinsicness on the PTL and ROS tended to infrequently attend. Value Conflict scores, as expected, were correlated with frequency of church attendance.

Also as expected, Humanitarianism scores were uncorrelated with frequency of church attendance.

Hypothesis 13 was partially confirmed. In line with expectations, Bible study attendance was seen to be correlated with Intrinsic Religiosity on both the PTL and ROS. Those scoring high in intrinsicness were consistently associated with frequent Bible study attendance. Also in line with expectations, Bible study was correlated with Extrinsic Religiosity in the expected direction. Scores representative of high extrinsicness on both the PTL and ROS were significantly associated with infrequent attendance at Bible studies. However, contrary to expectations, the relationship between Value Conflict scores and frequency of Bible study attendance was significant. Those scoring as high in value conflict were associated with infrequent Bible study attendance, while those scoring low in value conflict were associated with frequent Bible study attendance.

The relationship found between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of Bible study attendance was also contrary to expectations. While a negative relationship was expected, a nonsignificant correlation was found.

Hypothesis 14 was minimally confirmed. Contrary to hypothesized expectations, frequency of church social function attendance was uncorrelated with scores on the PTL Extrinsic subscale.

In line with hypothesis 14, the expected frequency of church social function attendance and Intrinsic Religiosity scores was found. Those scores representative of intrinsicness on the PTL were significantly correlated with frequent attendance of church social functions.

Contrary to expectations, no significant relationship existed between Value Conflict and frequency of church social attendance. Nor did a significant relationship exist between Humanitarianism subscale scores and frequency of church social attendance.

Hypothesis 15 was partially confirmed. Expectations were confirmed regarding the relationship between frequency of prayer meeting attendance and Intrinsic Religiosity. Scores representative of intrinsicness on both the PTL and ROS were consistently associated with high frequency of prayer meeting attendance. Expectations were also confirmed regarding the relationship between prayer meeting attendance and Extrinsic Religiosity. Both PTL and ROS extrinsic scores were significantly associated with low frequency of prayer meeting attendance.

Expectations were not confirmed regarding the relationship between Value Conflict scores and frequency of prayer meeting attendance.

The hypothesized negative relationship between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of prayer meeting

attendance was not confirmed. No significant relationship was seen to exist between humanitarianism and prayer meeting attendance.

Hypothesis 16 was partially confirmed. A confirmation of the hypothesized relationship between frequency of prayer and Intrinsic Religiosity was found with both the PTL and ROS intrinsic subscales. Scores representative of high intrinsicness were significantly associated with a high frequency of prayer.

Confirmation of the hypothesized relationship between Extrinsic Religiosity and frequency of prayer was also found utilizing both the ROS and PTL Extrinsic subscales. Scores representative of extrinsicness were significantly associated with a low frequency of prayer.

The expected negative relationship between frequency of prayer and Value Conflict scores was not found. Value Conflict scores were not significantly correlated with frequency of prayer. Nor was the expected negative relationship between Humanitarianism scores and frequency of prayer found. The correlation was nonsignificant.

Hypothesis 17 was partially confirmed. A confirmation for the hypothesized relationship between place of prayer and Intrinsic Religiosity was found utilizing both the ROS and PTL Intrinsic subscales as measures of intrinsicness. Scores representing high states of intrinsicness were

significantly associated with prayer in any place at any time. Scores representative of low states of intrinsicness were associated with praying nowhere or only in church.

A confirmation of the hypothesized relationship between Extrinsic Religiosity and place of prayer was also found. Scores representative of high extrinsicness on both the PTL Extrinsic subscale and the ROS were significantly associated with praying nowhere or only in church.

No confirmation of the hypothesized negative relationship between Humanitarianism scores and place of prayer was found. This correlation was nonsignificant. No confirmation of the hypothesized negative relationship between Value Conflict scores and place of prayer was found. The correlation was also nonsignificant.

It is recognized that the present sample is a religiously selective sample. The sample is also skewed in the intrinsic and humanitarian directions. Partial correlations, removing the influence of the PTL Intrinsic and Humanitarianism scores, were often indicated. It should also be noted that the present sample may not adequately represent the egocentrism with hostility pole of the Humanitarianism subscale, as nominations of this type were not sought. Conclusions about the religious orientations are based on the data in the present investigation.

Evidence for construct validity is indicated for each of the PTL subscales. Included in this evidence is that many replications exist from the earlier study (see Peck, 1983) for each of the subscales. However, it is noted that the present and past investigations utilized two different types of samples: a lay sample that is religiously selective and represents a broader age range, and a sample of university students who were more restricted in age range. The literature indicates that disparate results may occur as a function of religiosity of the sample (Donahue, 1985a; Meadow & Kahoe, 1984). To the extent that replications from the earlier study occurred, the construct validity of the PTL is further bolstered.

Construct validation also included many replications utilizing the ROS as a measure of intrinsicness and extrinsicness in the present study. It is noted that the ROS is scored for consistently intrinsic and extrinsic types, and arrives at a final intrinsic or extrinsic score based on items from both its subscales. This situation may not ideally reflect relationships between the ROS and other subscales (e.g., the Humanitarianism subscale) which may be related to concepts of intrinsicness and extrinsicness.

Construct validity was ascertained on the PTL Intrinsic and Value Conflict subscales where scores of nominated criterion groups stood out from among other nominees as

representative of the construct. The humanitarian nominees did not stand out in scoring as most humanitarian on the Humanitarianism subscale. As a criterion group, extrinsic nominees did not perform according to expectations on the PTL Extrinsic subscale, nor on the ROS. In fact, this group scored like intrinsic nominees on all subscales. This raises questions about the validity of these subscales as well as questions regarding the reliability of the extrinsic nominations.

The theoretical congruency of the relationships between the various subscales and the subscales' relationships with the various religious biographical data items also indicate construct validity for the subscales. The relative position of the extrinsic nominee group according to theoretical expectations on the subscales was again nonsupportive of construct validity in a consistent fashion.

The PTL Intrinsic subscale fared well regarding construct validity. The Intrinsic subscale is capable of measuring the consistently intrinsic type as defined by the ROS.

As identified by the PTL, intrinsics are low in extrinsicness and value conflict and high in humanitarianism. These relationships are theoretically congruent for those high in intrinsicness. Humanitarian characteristics that the intrinsic and humanitarian

orientations have in common are most likely respect and regard for others, concepts of forgiveness, caring and sharing. Other evidence indicates that what separates these two orientations is their religious motivation and intensity of religious beliefs.

Intrinsics are seen to be frequently attending Bible studies, worship services, prayer meetings and church social functions. They are associated with frequent prayer, tend to pray in any place at any time, prefer to join a Bible study to a church social fellowship and endorse definite belief in God. These relationships evidence strong religious motivation for the intrinsic.

Intrinsics tend to present as socially desirable. The literature supports this relationship (Watson et al., 1984a; Batson et al., 1978). It may be that the characteristics of both intrinsicness and humanitarianism in conjunction are responsible for this intensify the motivation to do the "right thing."

Intrinsics tend to be associated with authoritarian characteristics. Other literature has shown the intrinsic (as measured by the ROS) to be uncorrelated with authoritarianism (Kahoe, 1974; Feagin, 1964; Strickland & Shaffer, 1971; Wilson, 1960). The earlier investigation (Peck, 1983) is in line with these latter studies. Bergin (1983) referred to the existence of inherent scoring biases

which exist against pro-religious responses on measures of authoritarianism.

Demographically, intrinsics tend not to be specifically associated with age nor sex. Hence, intrinsics appear to exist crossing both age and sex barriers.

Extrinsics have been poorly represented and studied in the literature. Problems abound in identifying this religiously sociopathic type. The present study proffered a small number of extrinsic nominees who came solely from one denomination, a result of one clergyperson's judgment.

Among the problems inherent in identifying the extrinsic may be a defensive denial on the part of clergy to recognize numbers of extrinsics in their congregations. On the other hand, the extrinsic would in all likelihood not want to be discovered for what he or she truly is in a religious sense. This would be antithetical to one's purposes. Hence, the extrinsic may employ tactics of evasiveness, set forth a facade of religious righteousness, and, in essence, operate in a sociopathic manner in the religious realm. An important implication of these factors is that a reliable and valid measure of extrinsicness is needed to aid in identification of this religious orientation.

The PTL Extrinsic subscale is indicated to be fairly reliable and valid by the data utilizing PTL-identified

extrinsics. The Extrinsic subscale is capable of measuring the consistently extrinsic type as measured by the ROS.

The PTL Extrinsic subscale identified the extrinsic as low in intrinsic religiousity, high in value conflict and inconsistently related to humanitarianism. Extrinsics attend church (though on a less frequent basis than intrinsics), yet tend not to believe in God. They are associated with low frequencies of prayer, praying only in church or in a critical situation, or not at all. In this vein, it is noteworthy that the present sample overwhelmingly affirmed being members of a church. Extrinsics tend to be inconsistent in attending church social functions, rarely to never attend Bible studies or prayer meetings and would generally prefer to join a social fellowship to a Bible study.

Extrinsics may vary in authoritarian characteristics. They also appear to be variable in their presentation of social desirability. The literature supports this relationship with social desirability (Watson et al., 1984a; Batson et al., 1978). No sexual bias was associated with scoring as extrinsic. However, those high in extrinsicness tend to be younger.

The Value Conflict subscale fared well regarding construct validity. It reflects the state of value conflict

in the religious realm that is a religious orientation in its own right.

As identified by the Value Conflict subscale, those in value conflict were not of the intrinsic ilk, and may be more extrinsic or humanitarian than other religious orientations. Those high in value conflict tended to be variable in frequency of worship service attendance, church social attendance and prayer meeting attendance. They also tended to be variable in frequency of prayer, place of prayer and belief in God. However, they tended to shy away from Bible studies and preferred to join a church social fellowship to a Bible study. The inconsistencies indicate inconsistencies in religious motivation and commitment for this orientation.

Perhaps an approach-avoidance conflict exists for persons of this orientation. They may vacillate between seeking out religion as a source of solution and stability in order to lessen their experience of value conflict, or avoiding religion and religious activities in an attempt to reduce or escape further upsets in valuational systems.

Those high in value conflict tended to be younger. This orientation was not related to gender. While those in value conflict tended to present with no more social desirability in general than the other orientations, it was indicated that those high in value conflict tended to be low

in social desirability. Those high in value conflict tended to present as low in authoritarianism.

A strong backbone of construct validity for the Humanitarianism subscale was indicated by the data. The humanitarian religious orientation appeared to be a distinctive orientation in its own right, separate from the intrinsic orientation. As mentioned above, these orientations shared commonalities but varied in terms of religious motivation and commitment. Humanitarianism was inconsistently related to extrinsicness. Some humanitarians may, and some may not, have extrinsic dealings with religion. Comparatively speaking, as a group, humanitarians experienced more value conflict than intrinsics and perhaps as much value conflict as extrinsics. However, within the humanitarian orientation there was no consistent pattern of association between value conflict and humanitarianism overall.

Humanitarians were inconsistent in regard to worship service attendance, prayer meeting attendance, Bible study attendance, preference for joining a Bible study or a social fellowship, church social function attendance, frequency of prayer, place of prayer and belief in God.

Humanitarians appeared to be less authoritarian than the intrinsic and value conflict orientations. Within the humanitarian group itself, however, no consistent pattern of

association with authoritarianism existed, and humanitarians scored variably on the authoritarianism measure. Humanitarians were presenting with no more or less social desirability than other orientations. Within the humanitarian population itself, however, humanitarians scored variably on the social desirability scale.

In conclusion, the PTL subscales evidenced support for construct validity in the present investigation. In terms of religious motivation, the intrinsic orientation was highest and the extrinsic orientation was lowest, with the humanitarian and value conflict orientations somewhere in between.

In comparison with the ROS, the PTL as a measure of religious orientation presents an advantage. The PTL provides two separate subscales with which to measure consistently intrinsic and consistently extrinsic religious orientations which represent high and low ends of each respective continuum. The ROS as a single measure of the consistent intrinsic and extrinsic types has no capacity to separate those scoring high in, e.g., intrinsicness from those scoring low in intrinsicness. This interferes with measurement of variables which may be related to intrinsicness and extrinsicness separately or in an opposing manner. For example, individuals of the humanitarian ilk may have characteristics in common with intrinsicness, but

are not necessarily of the extrinsic ilk as the ROS would indicate.

The present investigation found the PTL Extrinsic subscale and the ROS in correlation with the variables of frequency of Bible study and prayer meeting attendance, frequency of prayer, place of prayer and belief in God to be significant in the same direction. However, discrepancies existed between the PTL and ROS in determining correlates of extrinsicness with regard to the variables of social desirability, authoritarianism, humanitarianism and frequency of church social attendance. These discrepancies dissipate when the influence of the PTL Intrinsic scores is removed from the correlation between the ROS and the variable of interest.

While the ROS can be divided into two separate subscales and used as two separate dimensions in this respect, it either loses its ability to represent the consistently intrinsic or extrinsic types or it traditionally entails the use of median scores to represent the consistent types. Such use of the ROS is questionable (see Kahoe, 1976).

The PTL addresses religious orientation in a multi-dimensional manner, providing four separate measures of religious orientation. The value conflict and humanitarian

religious orientations have not been previously addressed in the literature to this author's knowledge.

The reliability of the PTL Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales taken together as one subscale is .83 (as measured by coefficient alpha). The reliability of the ROS as a single measure is .86. The PTL Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales together have a total of 16 items. The ROS contains a total of 20 items. If the number of items on the PTL combined version were increased to 20, the reliability of the subscale would be greater, and, in fact, was estimated at present to be .86 (estimated by Spearman-Brown formula; Brown, 1976).

At some point, the PTL Extrinsic subscale should add more items to increase its reliability. The Value Conflict subscale could also increase its reliability. The Humanitarianism subscale is also in need of an increase in reliability.

In terms of future research, the Humanitarianism subscale is in need of more items to further distinguish between intrinsic and humanitarian scorers. Items related to concepts of authoritarianism and religious biographical data items may be useful. The subscale also needs to be retested with a more general sample that insures representation of the egocentrism with hostility pole.

Implications for future research suggested by the present study are many. They include further construct validation verifying the internalization of intrinsic and extrinsic religious beliefs, a comparison of intrinsicness versus religious orthodoxy, exploration of the sexual bias in the humanitarian orientation, exploring the relationship between authoritarianism and extrinsicness, ascertaining the relationship between humanitarianism and value conflict, exploration of the purported bias in measures of social desirability and authoritarianism in relation to the religious orientations and further confirmation of the Extrinsic subscale as measuring the construct of extrinsicness. Implications for future research for the PTL are also indicated in the area of multi-dimensional scaling. Profile analyses with regard to the relationships between scores on the subscale within and between individuals would be instructive.

The PTL may move toward multidimensional scaling in the future. At present, while the PTL appears to be reliable and valid for use in research, it awaits the test of time and performance with other samples.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper.
- Allport, G. W. (1956). The Individual and His Religion. New York: Macmillan.
- Allport, G. W. (1959). Religion and prejudice. The Crane Review, 2, 1-10.
- Allport, G. W. (1963). Behavioral Science, religion and mental health. Journal of Religion and Health, 2, 187-197.
- Allport, G. W. (1966). Traits revisited. American Psychologist, 21, 1-10.
- Allport, G. W. & Kramer, B. M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. Journal of Psychology, 22, 9-39.
- Allport, G. W. & Ross, M. J. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-443.
- American Association for Religious and Value Issues in Counseling. (1981, July). ARVIC Newsletter, p. 1.
- Baither, R. C. & Saltzberg, L. (1978, Dec.). Psychological Reports, 43, (3, pt. 1), 853-854.
- Baker, M., & Gorsuch, R. (1982). Trait anxiety and intrinsic-extrinsic religiousness. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 21, 119-122.
- Barron, F. (1953). An ego strength scale which predicts response to psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 327-333.
- Batson, C. D. (1976). Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 15, 29-45.
- Batson, C., Flink, C., Schoenrade, P., Fultz, J., & Pych, V. (1986). Religious orientation and overt versus covert racial prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50 (1), 175-181.

- Batson, C. D., & Gray, R. (1981). Religious orientation and helping behavior: Responding to one's own or to the victim's needs? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 511-520.
- Batson, C. D., Naifeh, S., & Pate, S. (1978). Social desirability, religious orientation, and racial prejudice. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17, 31-41.
- Batson, C. D., & Raynor-Prince, L. (1983). Religious orientation and complexity of thought about existential concerns. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22 (1), 38-50.
- Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. (1982). The Religious Experience. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benson, P., De Horthy, J., Jarman, L., Hanson, E., Hochschwender, M., Lebold, C., & Sullivan, J. (1980). Intrapersonal correlates of nonspontaneous helping behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 110, 87-95.
- Bergin, A. E. (1980). Psychotherapy and religious values. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48, 95-105.
- Bergin, A. E. (1983). Religiosity and mental health: A critical re-evaluation and meta-analysis. Professional Psychology, 14, 170-184.
- Beutler, L. (1979). Values, beliefs, religion and the persuasive influence of psychotherapy. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 16, 432-440.
- Bohrnstedt, G., Borgatta, E., & Evans, R. (1968). Religious affiliation, religiosity, and MMPI scores. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 7, 255-258.
- Bolt, M. (1975). Purpose in life and religious orientation. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 3, 116-118.
- Bradford, R. (1978). An investigation of religious orientation and mental abnormality. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39 (6-B), 2973-2974.

- Brannon, R. (1970, April). Gimme that old-time racism. Psychology Today, 3, 42-44.
- Brown, F. (1976). Principles of Educational and Psychological Testing. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Brown, L. (1964). Classification of religious orientation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4, 91-99.
- Clark, S. (1979). Death perspectives: Fear of death, guilt and hope as functions of Christian faith. Dissertation Abstracts International, 72 (1-B), 179-181.
- Crandall, J., & Rasmussen, R. (1975). Purpose in life as related to specific values. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31, 483-485.
- Daniel, E. (1982). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious motivation and patterns of the self-concept: An analysis of selected single young adults of the North Carribean Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42 (10-B), 4240.
- Darley, J., & Batson, C. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional factors in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 100-108.
- De Blassie, P. (1981). Christian meditation: A clinical investigation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, (3-B), 1167.
- Diegnan, M., & Murray, J. (1975). Religious beliefs, religious commitment and prejudice. Journal of Social Psychology, 97, 147-148.
- Dittes, J. (1969). Psychology of religion. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of Social Psychology Vol. 5. (pp. 390-451) Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Donahue, M. (1985b). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 400-419.
- Donahue, M. (1985a). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: The empirical research. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 418-423.

- Donahue, M. (1985b). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 400-419.
- Ellis, A. (1980). Psychotherapy and atheistic values: A response to A.E. Bergin's "Psychotherapy and religious values". Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 5, 635-639.
- Entner, P. (1977). Religious orientation and mental health. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38 (4-B), 1949.
- Ernsberger, D., & Manaster, G. (1981). Moral development, intrinsic extrinsic religious orientation and denominational teachings. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 30, 110-123.
- Falbo, T., & Sheppard, J. (1986). Self righteousness: Cognitive, power, and religious characteristics. Journal of Research in Personality, 20, 145-157.
- Feagin, J. (1964). Prejudice and religious types: A focused study of southern fundamentalists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4, 3-13.
- Feldman, K., & Newcomb, T. (1969). The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fiefel, H., & Nagy, V. (1981). Another look at fear of death. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 278-286.
- Frankl, V. (1967). Psychotherapy and existentialism. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Freud, S. (1953). Future of an illusion. New York: Liveright.
- Gillespie, D. (1983). An analysis of the relationship between denominational affiliation and religious orientation and death perspectives of the clergy. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44 (2-A), 867.
- Gorsuch, R. (1984). The boon and bane of investigating religion. American Psychologist, 39 (3), 228-236.

- Gorsuch, R., & Aleshire, D. (1974). Christian faith and ethnic prejudice. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 7, 281-307.
- Gorsuch, R., & Venable, D. (1983). Development of an "age universal" I-E scale. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22, 181-187.
- Gough, H. (1951). Studies in social intolerance: IV. Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 263-264.
- Greene, R. (1980). The MMPI: An interpretive manual. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Griffin, R., & Thompson, J. (1983). Does denominational affiliation make a difference? Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness revisited. Journal of Comparative Sociology and Religion, 10-11, 92-116.
- Groesch, S., & Davis, W. (1977). Psychiatric patients' religion and MMPI responses. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 168-171.
- Halleck, S. (1976). Discussion of "Socially reinforced obsessing." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 146-147.
- Hamby, J. (1973). Some personality correlates of religious orientation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (3-A), 1127-1128.
- Haynes, R. (1971). The effect of peer and authority social influence on the religious attitudes and beliefs of males and females who are intrinsic and extrinsic in religious orientation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (9-B), 4628-4629.
- Henry, W., Sims, J., & Spray, S. (1971). The fifth profession: Becoming a psychotherapist. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hilty, D., Morgan, R., & Hartman, W. (1985). A structural equation modeling analysis of the means, end and quest dimensions. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 424-436.
- Hinton, J. (1972). Dying. Baltimore: Penguin Press.
- Hogan, R. (1979, April). Interview. APA Monitor, pp. 4-5.

- Hoge, D. (1972). A validated intrinsic religious motivation scale. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 369-376.
- Hood, R. (1978). The usefulness of the indiscriminately pro and anti categories of religious orientation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17, 419-431.
- Hood, R. (1985). The conceptualization of religious purity in Allport's typology. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 413-417.
- Hood, R. & Morris, R. (1985). Conceptualization of quest: A critical rejoinder to Batson. Review of Religious Research, 26, 391-397.
- Hunsberger, B. (1980). Problems and promise in the psychology of religion: An emerging social psychology of Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 12, 64-77.
- Hunsberger, B., & Platonow, E. (1986). Religion and helping charitable causes. The Journal of Psychology, 120, 517-528.
- Hunt, R., & King, M. (1969). Measuring the religious variable: Amended findings. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8, 321-323.
- Joe, V., McGee, S., & Glazey, D. (1977). Religiousness and devaluation of a rape victim. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 64.
- Jones, E. (1923). Papers on psychoanalysis. London: Balliere, Tindall and Cox.
- Jung, C. (1938). Psychology and religion. London: Yale University Press.
- Kahoe, R. (1974). Personality and achievement correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 812-818.
- Kahoe, R. (1976). Comment on Thompson's "Openmindedness and indiscriminate antireligious orientation". Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13, 471-477.

- Kahoe, R. (1985). The development of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 408-412.
- Kahoe, R., & Dunn, R. (1975). The fear of death and religious attitudes and behavior. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14, 379-382.
- Kahoe, R., & Meadow, M. J. (1981). A developmental perspective on religious orientation dimensions. Journal of Religion and Health, 20, 8-17.
- Kessel, P., & McBrearty, J. (1967). Some myths of psychotherapy research and the search for a paradigm. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 110-136.
- Kiesler, D. J. (1966). Some myths of psychotherapy research and the search for a paradigm. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 110-136.
- Kilbourne, B., & Richardson, J. (1984). Psychotherapy and new religions in a pluralistic society. American Psychologist, 39 (3), 237-251.
- Kirkpatrick, C. (1949). Religion and humanitarianism: A study of institutional implications. Psychological Monographs, 63 (9, whole no. 304).
- Kivett, V. (1979). Religious motivation in middle ages: Correlates and implications. Journal of Gerontology, 34, 106-115.
- Kivett, V., Watson, J., & Busch, J. (1977). The relevant importance of physical, psychological and social variables to locus of control orientation in middle age. Journal of Gerontology, 32, 203-310.
- Laaser, M. (1981). Religion and heart disease: An investigation of their association as expressed in the religious dimensions of the coronary-prone behavior pattern--type A. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42 (5-A), 2171.
- Lilienfeld, D. (1966). The relationship between mental health information and moral values of lower class psychiatric clinic patients and psychiatric evaluation and disposition. Dissertation Abstracts International, 27, 610B-611B.

- Lockwood, C. (1982). Psychosocial adjustment to cancer and its relationship to social interest, dysfunctional beliefs, religious orientation, and selected physical and demographic variables. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43 (3-B), 854.
- London, P. (1976). Psychotherapy for religious neuroses? Comments on Cohen and Smith. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 145-146.
- Magni, K. (1973). The fear of death. Studies of its character and commitments. In L. Brown (Ed.), Psychology and religion. Baltimore: Penguin Press.
- Malony, H. (Ed.). (1977). Current perspectives in the psychology of religion. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Martin, C., & Nichols, R. (1962). Personality and religious belief. Journal of Social Psychology, 56, 3-8.
- Marx, I., & Spray, S. (1969). Religious biographies and professional characteristics of psychotherapists. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 10, 275-288.
- McCarthy, J. (1975). Death anxiety, intrinsicness of religion and purpose in life among nuns and Roman Catholic female undergraduates. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35 (11-B), 5646.
- McClain, E. (1978). Personality differences between intrinsically religious and nonreligious students. Journal of Personality Assessment, 42, 159-166.
- Meadow, M. J., & Kahoe, R. (1984). Psychology of religion: Religion in individual lives. New York: Harper and Row.
- Miller, R. (1976). The religious value system of Unitarian Universalists. Review of Religious Research, 17 (3), 189-208.
- Minton, B., & Spilka, B. (1976). Perspectives on death in relation to powerlessness and form of personal religion. Omega, 7, 261-267.
- Morris, R., & Hood, R. Jr. (1981). The generalizability and specificity of intrinsic/extrinsic orientation. Review of Religious Research, 22, 245-254.

- Nix, V. (1978). A study of the religious values of psychotherapists. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39 (4-B), 1965.
- Peck, B.J.C. (1983). Intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivation as expressed in the PTL scale of values Unpublished master's thesis. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
- Photiadis, J., & Biggar, J. (1962). Religiosity, education and ethnic distance. American Journal of Sociology, 67, 666-672.
- Ray, J. (1976). Do authoritarians hold authoritarian attitudes? Human Relations, 29, 307-325.
- Reik, T. (1951). Dogma and compulsion. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Religion in America. (1981). Princeton, N.J.: The Gallup Organization.
- Rice, C. (1971). The relationships of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations to selected criteria of mental health. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32 (4-A), 2194.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind: Investigations into the nature of belief and personality systems. New York: Basic Books.
- Scheier, I., & Cattell, R. (1960). Handbook and test kit for the IPAT anxiety battery. New York: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Smith, W. (1978). The effects of two kinds of religious experiences in relation to religious orientation and sex role identification. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39 (3-A), 1446.
- Smith, D., Wiegart, J., & Thomas, J. (1979). Self esteem and religiosity: An analysis of Catholic adolescents from five cultures. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 18, 51-60.
- Soderstrom, D., & Wright, W. (1977). Religious orientation and meaning in life. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 65.

- Spielberger, C., Gorsuch, R., & Lushene, R. (1970). Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Spilka, B., Kojetin, B., & McIntosh, D. (1985). Forms and measures of personal faith: Questions, correlates and distinctions. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 437-442.
- Spilka, B., Pelligrini, B., & Dailey, S. (1968). Religion, American values and death perspectives. Sociological Symposium, 1, 57-66.
- Spilka, B., Stout, L., Minton, B., & Sizemore, D. (1977). Death and personal faith: A psychometric investigation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 16, 169-178.
- Stember, H. (1961). Education and attitude change. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press.
- Stouffer, S. (1955). Communism, civil liberties and conformity. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. (1972). Short, homogenous versions of the Marlow-Crowne social desirability scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28, 191-193.
- Strickland, B., & Schaffer, S. (1971). I-E, I-E and F. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10, 366-369.
- Strickland, B., & Weddell, S. (1972). Religious orientation, social prejudice, and dogmatism: A study of Baptists and Unitarians. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 395-399.
- Strong, S. (1976). Christian counseling. Counseling and Values, 20, 151-160.
- Strong, S. (1977). Christian counseling in action. Counseling and Values, 21, 89-128.
- Strong, S. (1980). Christian counseling: A synthesis of psychological and Christian concepts. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 58, 589-592.

- Strupp, H. (1978). Psychotherapy research and practice: An overview. In S. Garfield & A.E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Sturgeon, R., & Hamby, R. (1979). Religiosity and anxiety. Journal of Social Psychology, 108, 137-138.
- Sullivan, W. (1977). Effect of religious orientation, purpose in life and locus of control on the death anxiety of college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38 (1-B), 382.
- Tapp, R. (1971). Dimensions of religiosity in a post-traditional group. Journal for the Scientific study of Religion, 10, 41-47.
- Tate, E., & Miller, G. (1971). Differences in value systems of persons with varying religious orientations. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10, 357-365.
- Terry, J. P. (1983). Construction and validation of the Peck-Terry-Layton scale of values. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
- Tong, J. (1978). Relationship between belief in the sovereignty of God, religious orientation and locus of control. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39 (5-A), 2811-2812.
- Van Haitsma, K. (1986). Intrinsic religious orientation: Implications in the study of religiosity and personal adjustment in the aged. Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 685-687.
- Vaughan, J. (1971). Measurement and analysis of values pertaining to psychotherapy and mental health. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 3655B.
- Watson, P., Hood, R., Morris, R., & Hall, J. (1984a). Empathy, religious orientation and social desirability. Journal of Psychology, 117, 211-216.
- Watson, P., Hood, R., & Morris, R. (1984b). Religious orientation, humanistic values, and narcissism. Review of Religious Research, 25 (3), 257-264.

- Wenger, S. (1981). Intrinsic religious motivation and the hospitalized, recovering alcoholic. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 (7-B), 2785-2786.
- Wiebe, K. F. & Fleck, J. R. (1980). Personality correlates of intrinsic, extrinsic, and nonreligious orientations. Journal of Psychology, 105, 181-187.
- Wilson, W. C. (1960). Extrinsic religious values and prejudice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60, 286-288.
- Winer, B.J. (1971). Statistical Principles in Experimental Design (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to a number of people without whose support this dissertation would not have been possible. To my three year old son, Christienn, and my 13 year old daughter, Anjela, who are experiencing incredible developmental stages, I owe much gratitude for bearing with the frequent loss of their mother in a multitude of papers, computer printouts and books. I am also thankful for the understanding and many moments of joy they unexpectedly brought me during times of stress and pressure. To my husband, Robert, I am indebted for providing me abundantly with the support needed to see my dissertation to completion. I am also grateful to my mother and father, Josephine and Neil Cannarelli, who unselfishly devoted much time and love to my children and thereby enabled me to complete this work.

To my major professor, Bill Layton, and committee member, Bob Strahan, I would like to especially express deepest gratitude for the extra time, effort, expertise and consideration they devoted to me and my dissertation. I would also like to thank the rest of my committee members, Fred Borgen, Tom Hannum and Dan Robinson, for their support in this endeavor. I also extend my appreciation to the clergy who participated in this study for the time and effort they devoted to me in gathering my data.

I would also like to thank the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research and the many subjects who participated in the study. The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, that risks were outweighed by the potential benefits and expected value of the knowledge sought, that confidentiality of data was assured and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures.

Most of all, I thank God for giving me the strength, knowledge and wisdom to see this project through.

APPENDIX A. THE PTL SCALE OF VALUES

1. It bothers me when someone won't forgive me.
2. When I hurt someone I try hard to make it up to the person.
- RX¹ 3. What religion offers most is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike.
- RI 4. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
- PRX 5. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
- M 6. I like to gossip at times.
7. When I've had a disagreement with someone I feel better when we can talk it over.
8. When I have important work to do, I can't be bothered with other people's problems.
9. It bothers me sometimes that my religious beliefs aren't what they used to be.
10. I often talk to God.
11. I think it's only fair to get back at someone who has wronged me.
- M 12. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
13. I am accountable to God for everything I do.
- M 14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
- PRX 15. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
16. Although I believe in religion, I believe or feel there are many more important things in life.

¹Note: Letters refer to scales from which items are derived. Scales are referenced at end of PTL scale of Values.

- A 17. Most people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.
- RX 18. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
- A 19. Many of the radical ideas of today will become the accepted beliefs and practices of tomorrow.
- A 20. People who want to whip or imprison sex criminals are themselves sick.
- M 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
22. I feel it is important to have a personal relationship with my Creator.
- RI 23. I read literature about my faith (or church) frequently.
24. I do not believe that the Bible is the ultimate authority in all matters.
- M 25. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.
- RI 26. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or of the Divine Being.
- M 27. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
28. I feel that my religious beliefs or values are in conflict.
- PRX 29. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
30. Sometimes I feel jealous or envious of others who do better than I.
- A 31. No sane, normal, decent person would ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
32. A person should not be punished for breaking a law that he thinks is unreasonable.
- M 33. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

- RX 34. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.
- A 35. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination and the will to work and fight for family and country.
- PRI 36. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
37. I feel stagnated when I'm not continually learning new things about my faith.
- M 38. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
- M 39. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
- M 40. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
- A 41. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
- RX 42. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
- RX 43. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
- A 44. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
- M 45. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
46. Trying to resolve conflicting values or beliefs can be very frustrating for me.
47. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
- M 48. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
- RX 49. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.
50. Sin is only a creation of one's imagination.

51. I feel that no man or woman is the ultimate authority on any subject.
- M 52. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
- M 53. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
54. It doesn't make sense for me to develop one set of beliefs since they cannot apply to every situation I encounter.
- A 55. It's all right for people to raise questions about even the most personal and private matters.
56. At times I resent being told what to do.
- M 57. I have never been irked when people express ideas very different from my own.
- A 58. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped or worse.
59. I always feel I have to explain or qualify my actions to others.
- M 60. I always try to practice what I preach.
- M 61. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
62. I prefer to follow the guidance of an expert rather than make my own decisions in some areas.
- A 63. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, are signs of mental illness; such people belong in hospitals rather than in prison.
64. Sometimes I go along with the things my friends do and then I feel bad afterwards.
- PRX 65. The church is most important as a place to make good social relationships.
- A 66. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas but as they grow older they ought to get over them and settle down.

- A 67. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude and respect for his parents.
- M 68. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
- A 69. Insults to our honor are not always important enough to talk about.
- A 70. Homosexuality between consenting adults may be distasteful but it should not be regarded as a crime.
- M 71. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
- RI 72. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.
- RI 73. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
- M 74. When I don't know something I don't mind at all admitting it.
75. The church puts too much restraint on the individual.

Please be sure to record your responses on the answer sheet provided.

76. Your age: Using item 76 on the answer sheet, code your present age as follows:

- | | | |
|--------------------|----------|------------------|
| a. younger than 18 | c. 30-40 | e. older than 61 |
| b. 18-29 | d. 41-60 | |

NOTE: On the answer sheet where it says BIRTHDATE please fill in the month, day and year.

SEX: On the answer sheet space where it says SEX please indicate your sex.

NOTE: On the answer sheet where it says GRADE or EDUCATION please indicate the highest grade completed in school.

77. Have you gone on to graduate school?
- a. No.
 - b. Yes, but I do not have a graduate degree.
 - c. I have a Master's degree.
 - d. I have a Ph.D.
 - e. I have an M.D.
78. Are you a member of a church?
- a. Yes b. No
79. What religious denomination were you raised in?
- a. Catholic c. Protestant e. None
 - b. Mormon d. Unitarian
80. What religious denomination would you consider yourself to be a member of now?
- a. Catholic c. First Evangelical
 - b. Lutheran d. None of the above
81. If none of the above denominations describe your church membership, would you consider yourself to be a member of:
- a. Christian Fellowship c. Jewish e. none
 - b. Unitarian d. Mormon of these
- RI 82. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church:
- a. more than once a week
 - b. about once a week
 - c. 2 or 3 times a month
 - d. less than once a month
 - e. I do not attend church at all
83. Besides worship services, I also participate in Bible studies...
- a. frequently c. rarely
 - b. occasionally d. never
84. Church social functions...
- a. frequently c. rarely
 - b. occasionally d. never

85. Prayer meetings...
- a. frequently c. rarely
 - b. occasionally d. never
86. If you were seeking counseling for other than academic reasons (e.g., a personal matter), which of the following would you most prefer to talk to?
- a. your priest, pastor, elder, bishop, etc. of the church
 - b. a Christian counselor
 - c. a Christian psychologist
 - d. none of the above
87. On the average, how often do you pray?
- a. more than once a day
 - b. once a day
 - c. once a week or less
 - d. only when in a very critical situation, or when in church
 - e. never
88. Where do you usually pray?
- a. nowhere (i.e., I do not pray)
 - b. usually nly in church
 - c. usually only at home
 - d. only at home and in church
 - e. any place and any time
89. Which statement best fits you?
- a. I definitely believe in God
 - b. I'm pretty sure i believe in God
 - c. I'm not quite sure whether or not I believe in God
 - d. I'm an agnostic
 - e. I'm an atheist
90. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible study group, or (2) a social fellowship:
- a. I would prefer to join (1)
 - b. I probably would prefer (1)
 - c. I probably would prefer (2)
 - d. I would prefer (2)

References to items:

R = items from the Religious Orientation Scale
(Allport & Ross, 1967):

RI = items keyed as intrinsic

RX = items keyed as extrinsic

A = items from the Short Balanced F Scale (Ray, 1976)

P = items also appear on the PTL Scale of Values (Peck,
1983)

M = items from the MC-20 (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972)

APPENDIX B. DESCRIPTIONS PROVIDED TO CLERGY

The following descriptions are provided to guide you in selecting the "types" of persons who will be asked to fill out questionnaires. Again, the names of individuals you nominate should not be given to me, nor put on the answer sheets. The survey is to be entirely confidential.

Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions. Thank you again for your help with collection of data for my dissertation. Your time and effort in this endeavor are very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Barbara Cannarelli Peck

Office: 294-8422

Home: 233-5264

During the summer I will be relocating. My new number will be available through contacting the psychology office at Iowa State: 294-1742.

Intrinsic Religious Orientation

The intrinsic individual's master motive in life is rooted in religious beliefs. Religious faith is a supreme value in its own right, and the intrinsic strives to transcend self-centered needs and a materially-oriented, "here and now" existence.

God and religious beliefs play an important, highly personal, motivating role in the daily existence of this person. Other necessities of life are regarded as of less ultimate significance than religious faith, and these other needs are brought into harmony with religious faith and beliefs as much as possible.

The intrinsic's life is guided and motivated by belief in the truth and reality of his or her religious faith. It is not religious behavior per se (e.g., church attendance, orthodoxy of beliefs, etc.) that identifies the intrinsic individual. The key factors are the motives behind the person's beliefs and behaviors. For the intrinsic, these motives come from within, because religious faith is truly internalized as a part of one's being. It is in this sense that the intrinsic individual can be said to live his or her religion.

Extrinsic Religious Orientation

For the extrinsic individual, religion and religious faith serve other needs. Religious faith and beliefs are not valuable in and of themselves. This individual views the primary value of religion as instrumental and utilitarian in the service of the self. For example, such values as prayer, faith, fellowship, etc., are held primarily because of self-interests. The full creed and teaching of religion is not adopted.

The key factor in identifying the extrinsic is that religious faith is second in position to the self. Religion is used to serve other needs, such as one's own security and welfare, solace and comfort, sociability and distraction, or status and self-justification. Examples of the extrinsic include the business person who attends church to make business contacts, or the politician who attends church and supports religious ideals such as school prayer to gain votes.

It is not the amount of religious beliefs or behaviors that these persons espouse, but the source of religious faith--- which is basically rooted in the interests of serving the self or other more ultimate interests/needs.

The extrinsic, then, uses religion--- she or he may turn to God, but not away from self.

Value Conflict

Individuals who are high in value conflict can be characterized as "fence-walkers"--- they have not totally accepted and internalized the tenets of their religious faith and/or beliefs, nor have they totally rejected them. Behavior is often inconsistent with their religious beliefs, which leads to the experience of value conflict.

Persons in value conflict seek out the clergy or other authoritative sources of information for guidance. They are aware of any contrast or discrepancy between behavior sanctioned by their religion and behavior performed. They may experience confusion over which values to hold, be indecisive, be troubled by doubts, have little faith in their own judgment, and feel a sense of guilt. These persons may rationalize their behavior and may feel they have to explain or qualify their actions and behavior. A basic conflict can be said to exist between religious values and personal wants, desires or needs; and this conflict is evident in the individual's actions and subsequent reactions to his or her own behavior.

Humanitarianism

The humanitarian individual is not espousing religious values in the traditional sense. While humanitarian value systems might be considered religious in a transcendent

sense, they are not orthodox religious beliefs based on Biblical principles emanating from the traditional notion of an Almighty God. Hence, these persons may be best characterized as religiously liberal, agnostic or atheistic.

Of central importance in the humanitarian's life are values that can be characterized as altruistic. Of primary importance is a valuing of personhood--- respect and esteem for humanity as well as the self are to be nurtured. Self-centered interests and motives are not of primary importance. The humanitarian is sensitive toward others and can be said to have a "conscience". Interpersonal relationships are valued as are qualities of caring, sharing, and a lack of hostility and vengeance. Fairness and equity are among the values the humanitarian strives for. Of major value is the quality of life in the here-and-now versus the hereafter. The meaning of life is sought after in the present, as belief in a life after death is considered to be secondary, irrelevant or nonexistent.

While many of the values of humanitarians may be consistent with many traditional religious values, they are adhered to primarily because of their humanitarian value, and not because the individual is devoted to a set of specific religious beliefs in the traditional sense.
